

Foreign  
Broadcast  
Information  
Service



A N N I V E R S A R Y  
1 9 4 1 - 1 9 9 1

# ***JPRS Report***

# **Proliferation Issues**

19980506 118

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT 4

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

# PROLIFERATION ISSUES

JPRS-TND-91-017

## CONTENTS

7 November 1991

[This report contains foreign media information on issues related to worldwide proliferation and transfer activities in nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, including delivery systems and the transfer of weapons-relevant technologies.]

### AFRICA

#### SOUTH AFRICA

Armcor: No Comment on Israeli Missile Parts [Johannesburg Radio] .....	1
IAEA To Receive Nuclear Material List 31 Oct [Johannesburg Radio] .....	1
Professors on Missile Prototype Capabilities [Johannesburg Radio] .....	1
Defense Cutbacks Threaten Overberg Test Range [THE ARGUS 20 Sep] .....	1

### CHINA

Parliament Defers Nonproliferation Treaty Progress [Tokyo KYODO] .....	2
Yang Shangkun on Regional Nonproliferation [XINHUA] .....	2
Daya Bay Nuclear Plant 'Safe' Despite 'Faults' .....	2
Faults in Design [Hong Kong SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST 22 Oct] .....	2
Adheres to French Standards [ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE] .....	3

### EAST ASIA

#### JAPAN

Research Team To Study Soviet Nuclear Industry [KYODO] .....	4
Annual White Paper on Nuclear Power Released [KYODO] .....	4

#### NORTH KOREA

Demand for Withdrawal of Nuclear Arms From South [KCNA] .....	4
Conservation Union Condemns South Nuclear Plant [KCNA] .....	5

#### SOUTH KOREA

High-Level Nuclear Talks Scheduled With U.S. [YONHAP] .....	5
Army Interested in Buying U.S. Patriot Missiles [THE KOREA TIMES 10 Oct] .....	5
Defense Minister Cites Need for Nuclear Umbrella [YONHAP] .....	5
Organizations Seek Withdrawal of Nuclear Weapons [YONHAP] .....	6
Kim Il-song Asked PRC Support for Nuclear Arms [YONHAP] .....	6
ROK, Thai Ministers Discuss North Nuclear Issue [YONHAP] .....	6
New North Korean Nuclear Facilities Revealed [YONHAP] .....	7
North 'Likely To Sign' IAEA Accord in February [YONHAP] .....	7
North Sticks to Nuclear Signing Stance at UN [YONHAP] .....	7
Defector on North's Nuclear Development [SEOUL SINMUN 9 Oct] .....	8
Defector Says North Produced Plutonium in 1987 [SEKYE ILBO 30 Oct] .....	9

### EAST EUROPE

#### BULGARIA

Disagreement About Origin of Arms Shipment [BTA] .....	11
BTA Says Ship Loaded in Italy .....	11
Government: Cargo Loaded in Burgas .....	11

Kozloduy Nuclear Plant 6th Reactor Repaired [Sofia Radio] .....	11
Havel Rejects Allegations of Arms Exports to Burma [CSTK] .....	11

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Report of Attempt To Sell Arms to Burma [LIDOVE NOVINY 21, 22 Oct] .....	11
Sale Said Thwarted .....	11
Ministry Makes Statement .....	12
Romania Denies Supplying Army With Arms, Equipment [TANJUG] .....	12
Traffickers Planned To Buy Arms for Croatia [TANJUG] .....	12
Croatia, South Africa Said To Produce Missiles [Belgrade Radio] .....	12
Documents Show Chemical Weapons Sent to Iraq [AFP] .....	12

## LATIN AMERICA

### ARGENTINA

Guinea-Bissau President Discusses Arms Sales [BUENOS AIRES HERALD 23 Oct] .....	14
CNEA Signs Uranium Exploration Contract [NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS] .....	14

### BRAZIL

Santana Views Results of IAEA Conference [GAZETA MERCANTIL 26 Sep] .....	14
Technology Transfer Control Bill Debated [EXAME 4 Sep] .....	15
Companies Participated in Iraqi Nuclear Projects [O GLOBO 3 Oct] .....	17

## NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

### REGIONAL AFFAIRS

South Asian Nation Calls Bush Plan 'Machiavellian' [Islamabad THE MUSLIM 2 Oct] .....	18
U.S. Seen Reviving Agreement With Pakistan [Secunderabad DECCAN CHRONICLE 24 Sep] ...	19
U.S. Shows Balanced Perspective in Amendment [Bangalore DECCAN HERALD 20 Sep] .....	19
Regional 'Denuclearization' of South Asia Urged [Islamabad THE MUSLIM 28 Sep] .....	20

### EGYPT

Israel 'Responsible' for Iran's Nuclear Program [AL-AHRAM 13 Oct] .....	21
---	----

### INDIA

Solanki: No U.S. Pressure To Sign Nuclear Pact [Delhi Radio] .....	21
Call for Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons [Delhi Radio] .....	22
Plans To Use Thorium in Reactors Noted [PATRIOT 15 Sep] .....	22
Bengal Geologists Find Radioactive Minerals [THE TELEGRAPH 13 Sep] .....	22

### IRAN

Radio Condemns French Nuclear 'Assistance' [Voice of Mojahed] .....	23
Nuclear Cooperation With China Denied [IRNA] .....	23
Mohajerani Demands Nuclear Capacity for Muslims [IRNA] .....	23

### IRAQ

PRC Denial of Role in Nuclear Program Reported [INA] .....	24
--	----

### ISRAEL

Ne'eman on Nuclear Projects With USSR [Tel Aviv Radio] .....	24
Arens Warns Knesset of 'Nuclear Weapons Era' [YEDI'OT AHARONOT 23 Oct] .....	24

## LIBYA

Alleged Technology Purchase From India Denied [JANA] .....	25
--	----

## PAKISTAN

Nuclear Program Perceived for Atomic Bomb' Use [THE FRONTIER POST 21 Sep] .....	25
Renowned Scientist Declares Nuclear Capability [DAWN 22 Oct] .....	26

## SOVIET UNION

Exodus of Soviet Nuclear Scientists Assessed [PRAVDA 15 Oct] .....	28
Reaction to German Plan To Deploy Nuclear Arms [TASS] .....	28
France To Help Modernize Nuclear Stations [IZVESTIYA 4 Oct] .....	29
China Will Accede to Nuclear Treaty [Beijing XINHUA] .....	29
Upon Completion of Legal Procedures .....	29
Nuclear Export Policy Detailed .....	29
Envoy to PRC: Arms To Remain in Far East [Tokyo KYODO] .....	29
Pugwash Council Urges End to Nuclear Weapons [TASS] .....	29
PRC Reaction to Reduction Proposals Cited [IZVESTIYA 9 Oct] .....	30
DPRK Ambassador on Nuclear Guarantees [TASS] .....	30
Kravchuk Cited on Nuclear Arms [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct] .....	30
Official Cited on Nuclear Weapons Issues [TASS] .....	31
Ukraine Seeks To Retain Nuclear Arms [TASS] .....	31
Landsbergis Fears Deployment of Nuclear Arms [TASS] .....	31
No Progress in Chemical Warfare Destruction [IZVESTIYA 22 Oct] .....	31

## WEST EUROPE

### REGIONAL AFFAIRS

NATO Expected To Scrap Short-Range N-Weapons [Beijing XINHUA] .....	34
---	----

### BELGIUM

Government Splits on Arms Sales to Saudi Arabia .....	34
Cabinet Reshuffle [Brussels Radio] .....	34
Impact on Arms Exports [AFP] .....	34

### FRANCE

Joxe Seeks Assurances on Soviet Nuclear Security [Paris TV] .....	34
Mitterrand Views Bush Arms Reduction Proposals [LE MONDE 1 Oct] .....	35
More Reduction Welcome .....	35
Defense Minister Comments .....	35
Thailand To Buy Air Defense Missiles [LE MONDE 6-7 Oct] .....	35
Accord Reached on Nuclear Research Funding [LE FIGARO 2 Oct] .....	35
Dumas: Uranium Main Problem in Iran Dispute [AFP] .....	36

### GERMANY

Concern About Lax EC Arms Export Controls [SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 12 Oct] .....	36
Talks Dispel Concern on Soviet Nuclear Weapons [ADN] .....	37
Plan To Sell Warships to Taiwan Being Decided [DER SPIEGEL 21 Oct] .....	37
Stoltenberg on Minimum Stock of Nuclear Weapons .....	38
Reduce Airborne Systems [DPA] .....	38
Reduce Nuclear Bombs [DIE WELT 16 Oct] .....	38
Government Orders Tighter Export Controls [WELT AM SONNTAG 20 Oct] .....	39
Companies Suspected in Iraq Weapons Production [BILD 21, 22 Oct] .....	39
Large Companies Involved .....	39
More Companies Investigated .....	40

Eleven Companies Suspected of Dealing With Iraq [BILD 23 Oct] .....	40
Leybold Said Involved in Iraqi Nuclear Program [DER SPIEGEL 7 Oct] .....	41
Companies Deny Giving Nuclear Technology to Iraq [DPA] .....	41
Charges of Nuclear Exports to Iraq Reported [DPA] .....	41
'Many' Firms Involved in Illegal Iraqi Deals [DPA] .....	41

#### NETHERLANDS

No Firms Involved in Iraq's Nuclear Program [Hilversum Radio] .....	42
---	----

#### UNITED KINGDOM

Background of Iraqi Nuclear Expert Reported [PRESS ASSOCIATION] .....	42
Hurd Presents Policy on Nuclear Export Safeguards [PRESS ASSOCIATION] .....	42
Defense Minister Announces UK Nuclear Reduction [PRESS ASSOCIATION] .....	42

#### INTERNATIONAL

Van den Broek Urges SFRY Arms Embargo [Hilversum Radio] .....	44
Mesic Opposes Arms Embargo as Helping Army [AFP] .....	44

## **SOUTH AFRICA**

### **Armcor: No Comment on Israeli Missile Parts**

*MB2710093891 Johannesburg South African Broadcasting Corporation Network in English 0900 GMT 27 Oct 91*

[Excerpts] THE WASHINGTON POST reports that American intelligence agencies have found out that Israel exported key ballistic missile components to South Africa, but that President George Bush has decided not to impose punitive sanctions against Israel. [passage omitted]

Approached for comment on the report, a spokesman for Armcor [Armaments Corporation of South Africa] said the organization would not comment on the procurement or sale of arms internationally.

### **IAEA To Receive Nuclear Material List 31 Oct**

*MB2810145691 Johannesburg South African Broadcasting Corporation Network in English 1400 GMT 28 Oct 91*

[Text] South Africa has to submit a list of all its nuclear material to the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] by Thursday [31 October]. The agency is conducting an investigation into South Africa's nuclear capability. The country became a signatory to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty last month.

The spokesman for the Atomic Energy Corporation of South Africa, Mr. (Nick) Lichtholm said that a signatory country had to provide an inventory of its nuclear stock within 30 days of the end of the month in which it became a signatory. Afterwards the international agency would inspect such a country's nuclear plants and facilities.

### **Professors on Missile Prototype Capabilities**

*MB1610175091 Johannesburg South African Broadcasting Corporation Network in English 1500 GMT 16 Oct 91*

[Text] South Africa has developed a missile prototype that gives this country both a ballistic missile capability and the ability to launch satellites into orbit, becoming one of only eight or nine countries in the world to be able to do so. This is the opinion of the University of Pretoria's Professor Mike Hough and Stellenbosch University space technology expert, Prof. Garth Milne.

They were reacting to the recent imposition of sanctions by the American Government against the proliferation of missiles and missile technology by Armcor [Armaments Corporation of South Africa].

### **Defense Cutbacks Threaten Overberg Test Range**

*92WP0052A Cape Town THE ARGUS in English 20 Sep 91 p 6*

[Article by Graham Lizamore: "Test Range Flights for Survival"]

[Text] The Overberg test range at Waenhuiskrans on the Southern Cape coast is now facing its sternest test—survival without state support.

The super-sophisticated internationally-acclaimed military test facility has been told by Armcor in no uncertain terms it will have to survive economically on its own or close down.

The directive follows government cut-backs in defence spending following the cessation of hostilities on South Africa's borders and the lessening of South Africa's pariah status internationally.

Now, a decade after Armcor was told by the Minister of Defence to develop a sophisticated multi-purpose weapons testing facility after the international arms embargo in 1977, the range will have to compete locally and internationally for contracts.

At stake is the international respect it gained as a high-tech military test range, and its ability to manage the 60,000 hectares of coastal flora under its control.

In response to what was described as a "great challenge" the Overberg management has opened its doors to the media with a promise that it will be "more open" in future.

The general manager, Dr. Jannie Malan, said that while the challenge was daunting, he was confident the new South Africa would make it easier for the sale of weapons and weapons systems and the multi-purpose nature of the test facility could see a boom in overseas interest.

He said the choice of the site had been ideal. It was situated in an area of few people and had the sea on one side and large farms on the other.

"There are very few test facilities that compare with the technology and space we have," he said.

Dr. Malan said the Overberg range was prepared to face its challenge. It was vital that talk about redistribution of wealth was balanced with active creation of wealth and job opportunities.

Also at stake was the future of the conservation effort the Overberg range believed it had a moral obligation to continue.

The site manager, Mr. Peter Page, who also spearheads environmental management, is determined to restore the fynbos on the vast site stretching from Waenhuiskrans to Cape Infanta.

"We have removed thousands of hectares of rooikranz that covered most of the site before we arrived. This effort has to continue," he said.

Already he had turned to the sale of ostrich chicks, antelope, the pulverising of rooikrantz as a mulch for gardens, and there were moves to create hiking trails.

**Parliament Defers Nonproliferation Treaty Progress***OW3110073491 Tokyo KYODO in English 0721 GMT 31 Oct 91*

[Excerpt] Beijing, Oct. 31 KYODO—The Chinese parliament held off approving a plan to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT], a parliament source said Thursday.

An eight-day session of the Standing Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress [NPC], which ended Wednesday, agreed to continue deliberations on the plan because preparations to draw up a bill have been delayed, the source said.

Prior to the opening of the committee's 22nd session, a spokesman told a news conference China has consistently called for a total ban on nuclear arms, believing that this first step is to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

On Thursday, another source called the situation behind the committee's decision "exceptional."

The source added that since there was no progress on arms reductions issues by U.S. President George Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev during their meeting in Madrid, there is a "strong possibility" that Chinese leaders may defer any decision on the NPT until progress has been achieved in that area. [passage omitted]

**Yang Shangkun on Regional Nonproliferation***OW2510164091 Beijing XINHUA in English 1607 GMT 25 Oct 91*

[Text] Beijing, October 26 (XINHUA)—Chinese President Yang Shangkun, shortly before going on a tour of Pakistan and Iran, has reiterated China's support for the establishment of a nuclear-free Asia.

In his written replies to questions from a Beijing correspondent of the ASSOCIATED PRESS OF PAKISTAN, Yang said China appreciates the proposal put forward by Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in June this year on holding consultations among the United States, the Soviet Union, China, India and Pakistan on nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia.

"We believe the proposal for a regional solution of nuclear non-proliferation is of positive significance for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia and the maintenance of peace and stability in this region," Yang said.

China has always supported the view of establishing a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, he said.

With regard to the proposed five-country consultation on nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia, he said, if the other countries concerned all agree to the proposal, China has no difficulty to participate.

As for whether he has any plans for "a stable set-up in Afghanistan" to discuss with the Iranian and Pakistan Governments, Yang said, "I will exchange views with the presidents of the two countries on questions of mutual interests, including the question of Afghanistan."

He expressed the hope that the various Afghan parties will reach an agreement so as to achieve a proper political settlement to the Afghan question at an early date, which will be conducive to peace and development in the region.

Asked about China's role in the new world order, Yang said that "in our view the new world order should be established on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence."

As the establishment of a new world order is the common task of all countries and people in the world, he said, "it is necessary to get them all into discussions."

All countries, big or small, rich or poor, strong or weak, are entitled to participate, he said.

"We are ready to have extensive exchanges of views with other countries in the spirit of seeking common ground while setting aside difference with a view to reaching common understanding in this respect and contributing our own share to the establishment of the new world order that is peaceful, stable, fair and rational," he said.

**Daya Bay Nuclear Plant 'Safe' Despite 'Faults'****Faults in Design***HK2210111391 Hong Kong SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST in English 22 Oct 91 p 3*

[By Daniel Kwan]

[Text] The Daya Bay nuclear power plant is safe but falls short of the standards required by its French manufacturer, according to a Chinese energy expert.

Mr Wang Zhende, a senior cadre at the Ministry of Energy (MOE), said they had discovered faults in the design of the nuclear plant and extra staff had been arranged to make up the time lost making corrections.

Mr Wang said at least 200 Chinese technicians transferred from the Qinshan Nuclear Plant near Shanghai were under training at Daya Bay.

Mr Wang, who still oversees several key energy projects in China although he has retired from the MOE's Capital Construction Department, said construction at Daya bay would take at least one more year.

"They (the French) have very strict standards on nuclear power and our engineering teams have difficulties in adapting to their standards...specially in the installation of piping," he said.

"The French delivered the equipment half-a-year late and this explains the delay," Mr Wang said.

However, Mr Wang said they had no plans to bring in foreign technicians to speed up construction.

Mr Wang confirmed that proposals have been made by Guangdong authorities for a second nuclear facility in the province.

At least three sites have been put forward; Daya Bay, Yangjiang and Taishan.

According to Mr Wang, the Chinese Government was not prepared to invest heavily in nuclear power and would continue to utilise fossil fuel and hydroelectric power to meet its energy needs.

"Environmentally speaking, nuclear power is clean but it takes a long time for construction and involves large sums of money," he said.

"Therefore, we are not going to build a large number of nuclear plants—at least not before the end of this century."

#### **Adheres to French Standards**

*HK2510003491 Beijing ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE  
in English 1508 GMT 24 Oct 91*

[Text] Hong Kong, October 24 (CNS)—Construction of the Daya Bay Nuclear Power Station has met the quality levels and safety standards set by France. With the completion of civil construction work on nuclear islands No. 1 and No. 2, the power station has entered the peak period of installation with the main equipment being properly installed. The current work lies in the installation of pipes and cable systems. The power station is gradually undergoing trial operations in preparation for full-scale running. Judging from the present progress, the No. 1 nuclear generating unit is scheduled to start operations in the summer of 1993.

After consultation with the Guangdong Nuclear Power Joint Venture Company Limited (GNPJVC), the Hong Kong Nuclear Investment Company Limited (HKNICL), in response to a news report last week in the territory on problems concerning the construction procedures of the power station, issued a statement saying that construction had always conformed from the very

beginning with quality and safety levels set by France. These standards had never been compromised in any way, nor would they be in the future.

The power station, assimilating the experience gained in the construction of nuclear power stations elsewhere in the world, decided to have its pressured water reactor equipment built by Framatome which employs standardized and systematic operations to guarantee safety. Turbine generators installed in the conventional island were supplied by GEC Turbine Generators of the United Kingdom. Project services also went to French enterprises which are full of experience in the construction of nuclear power stations.

The statement by HKNICL said that quality control carried out by joint venture companies and contractors ensured that the parties concerned strictly abode by the stipulated standards and procedures. Relevant documents had to be filed in detail and omission of any particular work procedures would never occur.

Construction procedures were carried out in accordance with four "musts": personnel taking part in the construction must be qualified; machines and tools as well as materials used in the construction must under prior inspection; the construction work must be under programme control and records along with information concerned must be kept complete.

The entire project management panel is made up of personnel both Chinese and foreign including senior management staff of Hong Kong's China Light and Power Co. Ltd., project management experts and engineers from nuclear power plants in France, the United States, Britain and Japan. The management control panel which was modelled on a typical management pattern employed by nuclear power plants throughout the world, was prudentially set up in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the project contract and with the actual need resulting from progress on the project. Such a composition made it necessary to work in line with international management patterns on the construction and abide by international practices. The construction of the Daya Bay Nuclear Power Station, therefore, can not help but proceed in a precise way in terms of quality, progress and investment.



## JAPAN

**Research Team To Study Soviet Nuclear Industry**  
*OW2410045491 Tokyo KYODO in English 0439 GMT  
24 Oct 91*

[Text] Tokyo, Oct. 24 KYODO—The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) will send a mission to the Soviet Union next spring to study how Japan's pledged assistance to the country should be applied in the nuclear power area, MITI officials said Thursday.

The mission, which will consist of experts from the ministry, the Japanese nuclear power industry, and academic world, will study the current operation of Soviet nuclear power plants, including safety control and waste disposal, the officials said.

The mission is a preliminary step in accordance with the government's pledge at the London summit to accept a total of 1,000 Soviet and East European nuclear power industry workers for training during the next 10 years, the officials said.

The findings of the mission will be helpful in setting up programs for trainees to teach them what they really need to know, they said.

The composition and schedule of the mission has not yet been finalized, but the plan will be outlined to the Soviet side in the first Japan-Soviet nuclear talks slated next week in Moscow, the officials said.

**Annual White Paper on Nuclear Power Released**  
*OW2510014591 Tokyo KYODO in English 0043 GMT  
25 Oct 91*

[Text] Tokyo, Oct. 25 KYODO—A radiation leak at the Mihama nuclear power plant in Fukui Prefecture in February "aroused feelings of anxiety" in the general public but did not harm the environment, the government's annual white paper on nuclear energy said Friday.

The white paper, approved by the cabinet Friday, acknowledged that nuclear power plants have the potential for danger but said safety in the industry has been assured.

The paper said public anxiety after the leak at the Kansai Electric Power Co. plant in Mihama, Fukui Prefecture, triggered the first activation of a plant's emergency core cooling system in Japan.

The anxiety showed the government will have to make efforts to win the "understanding and cooperation" of the public in its nuclear power program, the paper said.

The paper quoted a 1990 survey by the Prime Minister's Office, in which 65 percent of those questioned said nuclear power plants are necessary but 47 percent said they believed nuclear power generation is "not safe" compared with 44 percent who believe it is safe.

The paper said that in September 1991, Japan had 41 nuclear power reactors with a capacity of 32.22 gigawatts, or 26.3 percent of the nation's total power generated. A gigawatt is a unit of power equal to one billion watts.

An official of the Science and Technology Agency said at a press briefing that the government has set a target of 40 more nuclear reactors in operation by 2010.

Hideaki Tsuzuka, deputy director of the Atomic Energy Policy Research Office of the agency's Atomic Energy Bureau, said 12 new reactors are now either under construction or about to be constructed, in spite of "long and complicated procedures" required before approval can be given.

"We are not denying we are under very trying circumstances in trying to obtain in a credible manner the targets we have set," Tsuzuka said.

An antinuclear power group said widespread opposition to nuclear power has restricted the industry to a policy of increasing capacity through the addition of reactors at existing power plant sites.

"Since 1971, reactors planned for new sites have simply not been built. The 2010 target will be impossible," a group member said.

## NORTH KOREA

**Demand for Withdrawal of Nuclear Arms From South**

*SK1610065091 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
0449 GMT 16 Oct 91*

[Text] Pyongyang October 16 (KCNA)—NODONG SINMUN today comments on the fact that the United States has shelved the elimination of air-launched nuclear arms in South Korea.

The news analyst says:

This bespeaks that the proposed withdrawal of nuclear weapons from South Korea is not a comprehensive withdrawal but a partial and selected one. It means that the nuclear threat to the DPRK and the danger of a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula will still exist and Bush's short-range nuclear disarmament proposal is nothing but an empty talk without authenticity.

The news analyst further says:

The U.S. authorities, in bid to calm down public opinion at home and abroad calling for an immediate withdrawal of their nuclear weapons from South Korea and an end to the policy of nuclear blackmail and cover up their aggressive nature, had not admitted that nuclear weapons were deployed in South Korea. And they have asserted in a far-fetched way that the DPRK's signing of

the nuclear safeguards accord is one thing and the withdrawal of their nuclear weapons from South Korea is another.

As Bush's nuclear disarmament proposal admitted the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea and recognized the necessity of their withdrawal, it has become a stark fact that the DPRK's signing of the nuclear safeguards accord and the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea are inseparably related to each other. It clearly shows the fairness of our proposal claiming that if the problem of the DPRK's signing of the nuclear safeguards accord is to be solved, the U.S. nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from South Korea and the U.S. nuclear threat to the DPRK be removed, and if the problem of nuclear inspection is to be settled, an inspection should be made for the North and the South simultaneously.

The U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea are the root cause of the danger of a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula and the permanent threat to the Korean nation's rights to existence. If the United States wants to withdraw nuclear weapons from South Korea, it should do it from the ground, sea and air totally and completely and the nuclear threat to the DPRK should be removed virtually.

#### **Conservation Union Condemns South Nuclear Plant**

SK1110065691 *Pyongyang KCNA in English*  
0605 GMT 11 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Pyongyang October 11 (KCNA)—A spokesman for the Central Committee of the Korean Natural Conservation Union issued a statement to the press today, condemning the South Korean authorities for announcing a plan to build a nuclear power station in Kosong near Mt. Kumgang, a scenic spot of Korea and a noted place of the world for tourists. [passage omitted]

### **SOUTH KOREA**

#### **High-Level Nuclear Talks Scheduled With U.S.**

SK2510143691 *Seoul YONHAP in English* 1311 GMT  
25 Oct 91

[Text] Seoul, Oct. 25 (YONHAP)—South Korea and the United States will hold high-level diplomatic consultations in Washington Oct. 30 on North Korea's nuclear development and other issues, a Korean Government source said Friday.

Focus of the consultations will be U.S. President George Bush's Sept. 27 announcement on nuclear reduction and its after effects, further phase-out of U.S. Forces in Korea, and joint efforts to deter North Korea's nuclear development, the source said.

Assistant Foreign Minister for Political Affairs Chang Man-sun will lead the Korean delegation. Richard

Solomon, assistant secretary of state for East Asia and the Pacific, will be the chief U.S. delegate.

The source said the senior diplomats would coordinate agenda items for the Dec. 1 summit between Presidents No Tae-u and Bush, would review the outcome of the fourth round of inter-Korean prime ministers' talks, and discuss future directions.

On his way to Washington, Chang will visit Ottawa to discuss with Canadian officials bilateral cooperation at the third ministerial conference of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation in Seoul next month.

#### **Army Interested in Buying U.S. Patriot Missiles**

SK1010024091 *Seoul THE KOREA TIMES in English*  
10 Oct 91 p 2

[Text] Washington (YONHAP)—Raytheon Co., the U.S. manufacturer of the Patriot missile, said Tuesday that South Korea had expressed an interest in acquiring its antimissile defense system but had not placed an order yet.

"When such an order is approved by the U.S. Government, Raytheon will work with the army and the Department of Defense to fulfill that requirement," Dick Sherman, media relations manager, said.

The Korean Defense Ministry said it was interested in purchasing the antimissile defense system. However, no decision has been made yet, the ministry said.

#### **Defense Minister Cites Need for Nuclear Umbrella**

SK2110131291 *Seoul YONHAP in English* 1247 GMT  
21 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Seoul, Oct. 21 (YONHAP)—Defense Minister Yi Chong-ku said Monday South Korea needed U.S. nuclear umbrella whatever its form and that Seoul should allot 4 percent or more of its gross national product on defense.

Testifying before the National Assembly Defense Committee, Yi said, "as long as nuclear threat exists in our surroundings, we need U.S. nuclear umbrella whatever the form. We believe respecting the U.S. NCND (neither confirm, nor deny) policy is in conformity with our over-all security interests."

"The NCND policy is part of the nuclear policy maximizing the psychological effect deriving from the uncertainty (of nuclear presence). As long as the United States keeps nuclear capability...there will be no change in the effects of the NCND policy or the nuclear umbrella," he said.

He said the government was studying various counter-measures against possible misjudgment on the part of North Korea, but not a tripartite meeting involving South and North Korea and the United States on nuclear issues.

"The government is working on various countermeasures, as North Korea may mistake the new nuclear policy of the United States as contributing to forming a climate for its military provocation against South Korea.

"We may discuss with the United States such things as introducing ultra-modern conventional arms or equipping the U.S. forces in Korea with them. We have never considered a tripartite meeting concerning the nuclear inspection of North Korea."

North Korea is believed to be only a few years away from producing an atomic bomb or is already capable of doing so. World governments and international agencies call on North Korea to open its nuclear facilities to outside inspection, but the North has not complied, arguing such an inspection should be made simultaneously in both halves of the Korean peninsula.

Commenting on the call for reduction of defense expenditure, the minister said 4 percent or more of the gross national product should be put aside for military spending to deter North Korea's combat capability.

"Our military spending exceeded North Korea's from 1976, but the North has poured more than 48 percent of its total military expenditure on building up combat power while we shared only 33 percent. When comparing the accumulative total, our investment lingers around 71 percent of the North's," he said. [passaged omitted]

### **Organizations Seek Withdrawal of Nuclear Weapons**

*SK1410032791 Seoul YONHAP in English 0301 GMT 14 Oct 91*

[Text] Seoul, Oct. 14 (YONHAP)—An anti-nuclear organization embracing 15 political and social groups announced on Monday they would seek a National Assembly legislation that would require scrapping or withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from South Korea.

The so-called Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in the Korean Peninsula told a news conference that it will propose the legislation through Yi Hae-chan and six other National Assemblymen.

The legislation, if passed, would ban manufacturing, developing, testing and possession of nuclear weapons in South Korea within one year. It would ban military exercises for the deployment of nuclear weapons and require the submission of all nuclear documents to the National Assembly.

It would also ban aircraft or vessels carrying nuclear weapons from flying over or passing through South Korea's airspace or territorial waters.

The committee, headed by Kye Hun-che, a noted dissident, made no mention of alleged development of nuclear weapons by North Korea.

The committee, which include the National Alliance for Democratic Movement, the country's main dissident organization, and the Korea Anti-Pollution Movement Association, said it has been participating in a signature-signing movement for de-nuclearization of the Korean peninsula and adoption of a non-aggression declaration by South and North Korea.

### **Kim Il-song Asked PRC Support for Nuclear Arms**

*SK2910091491 Seoul YONHAP in English 0851 GMT 29 Oct 91*

[Text] Seoul, Oct. 29 (YONHAP)—North Korean President Kim Il-song tried to win Chinese approval of, and support for, his country's development of nuclear arms during his visit to China this month, a South Korean Government official said Tuesday.

Kim did not seem to seek Chinese advice on how to solve his country's economic difficulties or end its isolation from the international community, he said.

"The prime goal of Kim's visit to China seems to have been securing an excuse and justification for his nation's development of nuclear weapons. North Korea believes nuclear arms development is vital for its own survival and maintenance of its system.

"North Korea's call to make Korea a nuclear-free zone betrays a will to earn time for nuclear development and pull China and the Soviet Union to its side to avoid international pressure," he said.

China, which is expected to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty shortly, has not publicly referred to North Korea's nuclear program, but holds the position privately that it would be desirable for neither South nor North Korea to have nuclear weapons, he said.

It remains to be seen what attitude China will take if a resolution to impose inspection on North Korea of its nuclear facilities is referred to the U.N. Security Council, but there is no doubt the situation will not improve for the North despite its aged leader's visit to China, the official said.

### **ROK, Thai Ministers Discuss North Nuclear Issue**

*SK2910131491 Seoul YONHAP in English 1242 GMT 29 Oct 91*

[Text] Bangkok, Oct. 29 (YONHAP)—South Korean Youth and Sports Minister Pak Chol-on and Thai Foreign Minister Asa Sarasin agreed Tuesday on the need for their countries to make concerted efforts to get North Korea to sign a nuclear safeguards accord and open its nuclear facilities to outside inspection.

Pak asked the Thai minister to make diplomatic efforts to let North Korea sign the International Atomic Energy Agency's nuclear safeguards accord under which the

signatory should open its facilities to international inspection. Sarasin said his government would make every possible effort.

Pak is to leave for Japan Wednesday, winding up his trip to Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.

### **New North Korean Nuclear Facilities Revealed**

SK2910014391 Seoul YONHAP in English 0125 GMT  
29 Oct 91

[Text] Tokyo, Oct. 29 (YONHAP)—A Japanese scholar claimed Monday he has found what appears to be another large complex of facilities in North Korea designed to produce nuclear bombs.

Toshibumi Sakada, director of Tokai University's Information Center, confirmed the existence of the new nuclear facilities in Pakchon, north of Pyongyang, in an article published Monday in ASAHI SHIMBUN's weekly newsmagazine, AERA.

In the article accompanying a number of photographs, Sakada said he was able to detect what appears to be a nuclear bomb manufacturing facilities in an area north of Pyongyang by analyzing images recorded last September by France's National Aeronautic Research Center's earth observation satellite.

Sakada, internationally recognized authority on photo image analyzer, was the first civilian who had exposed the existence of nuclear facilities in Yongbyon, also north of Pyongyang, to the world, using the same technique and the same French satellite's photographs.

There is a strong possibility that the newly found facilities, scattered in a wide area in Pakchon, contain plants capable of splitting plutonium, a crucial step in the process of manufacturing nuclear weapons, Sakada said.

He said the new facilities, like that of Yongbyon, are considerably large in size with tall buildings. Their spectrograms are also similar to that of Yongbyon, he added.

According to the photographs shown in the magazine, the facilities extend about 1 kilometer with what appears to be a heliport. These facilities, placed deep in the mountains with well paved roads, could not be ordinary industrial plants or mines, Sakada said.

Sakada's disclosure confirms an earlier claim by a North Korean diplomat who defected to South Korea in September. He said North Korea has underground facilities near Pakchon which are related to its nuclear development program.

Sakada said the newly found facilities are located four kilometers east of Pakchon. They are built on the sides of mountains, he said, and they must be closely related to what the former North Korean diplomat said were the underground facilities.

Sakada also said he could not rule out the possibility that North Korea, realizing it has to accept international inspection of nuclear facilities eventually, may be transferring plutonium and plutonium processing facilities to elsewhere from Yongbyon.

### **North 'Likely To Sign' IAEA Accord in February**

SK2110025891 Seoul YONHAP in English 0246 GMT  
21 Oct 91

[Text] Seoul, Oct. 21 (YONHAP)—North Korea is likely to sign a nuclear safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) when the IAEA Board of Governors meets in February next year, a South Korean Government official said Monday.

Although North Korea has delayed signing, insisting on withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea first and renunciation of nuclear development later, it was expected to sign an accord timed with the board meeting to avoid growing international pressure, he said.

Even after signing, however, North Korea was expected to delay international inspection of its nuclear facilities by citing procedural matters such as ratification of the accord, he said.

### **North Sticks to Nuclear Signing Stance at UN**

SK2310073291 Seoul YONHAP in English 0712 GMT  
23 Oct 91

[Text] United Nations, Oct. 22 (OANA-YONHAP)—North Korea told the United Nations on Tuesday it would not sign a nuclear safeguards accord unless all atomic weapons were withdrawn from South Korea.

North Korea had come under fire during two days of extensive discussions by the General Assembly on nuclear inspection.

Twelve out of 23 nations, including South Korea, pinpointed North Korea as one of the countries that must immediately sign a nuclear safeguards accord and open its nuclear-related facilities to outside inspection.

The controversy is apparently not over here as South and North Korea are both scheduled to take the floor next week at the first committee on disarmament.

The debate on nuclear inspection followed submission by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) of its annual report. The general focus was nuclear non-proliferation, expanding safeguards accord signatories, countering Iraq's nuclear program and the safety of nuclear power plants.

The European Community, Australia, the United States, Poland, Austria, Japan, Romania, New Zealand, Finland, Hungary, Bulgaria and South Korea registered concerns about North Korea's nuclear capability and demanded it open itself up to outside inspection.

South Korean Ambassador No Chang-hui told the Assembly Tuesday of Seoul's "serious concern" about Pyongyang's delay in signing an accord, to which a North Korean delegate replied that signing would not precede complete withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the South.

Pyongyang signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1985 but has yet to sign a safeguards accord, an obligation to be fulfilled within 18 months of signing the NPT.

It claims threat of nuclear attack against the North remains as long as the United States has nuclear weapons deployed in the South and it demands that the weapons be removed before it signs an accord or allows outside inspection.

Prime Minister Yon Hyong-muk and Vice Foreign Minister Chon In-chol of North Korea made clear to the United Nations that Pyongyang would not abandon this condition despite the U.S. announcement Sept. 27 that Washington would remove tactical weapons from overseas.

The two Koreas joined the United Nations Sept. 17. Seoul said it did not want to discuss inter-Korean problems at international forum such as the United Nations, but observers here say that a confrontation, indirectly at least, may be unavoidable.

North Korea will address the committee on disarmament on Oct. 28 and South Korea on Oct. 30.

### **Defector on North's Nuclear Development**

*SK2010112391 Seoul SEOUL SINMUN in Korean  
9 Oct 91 p 5*

[Sixth installment of article entitled: "Ko Yong-hwan, Former Interpreter for Kim Il-song and High-Ranking North Korean Diplomat, Speaks"]

[Text] If one thinks that in view of its economic difficulties North Korea's military industry is nothing special, one is greatly mistaken. An episode illustrates this.

On 15 April 1987, Han Tok-su, chairman of General Federation of Korean Residents in Japan [Chongnyon], led a delegation to North Korea to congratulate Kim Il-song on his birthday. In a meeting with a high-ranking North Korean official, Chairman Han said: "Knowing North Korean residents' difficulties in living, a number of compatriots in Japan are trying to leave Chongnyon, being skeptical about North Korea. Is there a good method for preventing this?" Thus, he revealed his painful position.

To this, a high-ranking North Korean official, without making lengthy remarks, simply stated: "I will guide you to a plant, and let us talk about this after the tour."

The place where Chairman Han was guided was the 18 January Machine Plant (another name is Kagam plant) located in Kagam-ni, Kaechon County, South Pyongan

Province. This plant is a complex for manufacturing military supplies, and its production facilities are built underground. Missiles, tanks, and motors are the main products of this complex.

Because the plant was built underground beneath a collective apartment area, only very few people living in Kaechon know about this plant. According to my elder brother, Ko Pang-nam (47), who once worked in Kagam plant and now is a design technician in Mangyongdae light electric appliances and machine plant (where ground-to-ship missiles are produced), the underground tunnels are so long that one cannot see their ends even if one walks all day long. After touring this plant, Chairman Han was reported to have said, "I was not aware that North Korea is so powerful. Now I have confidence in carrying out my duties."

Today, the issue of North Korea's development of nuclear weapons has become the one attracting people's keen interest. However, this issue is kept top secret in North Korea, and thus the people who have detailed knowledge about the background of this issue would be only four or five, including Kim Il-song and his son.

Therefore, I cannot precisely tell whether North Korea has already developed nuclear weapons or is in a stage of development to a certain degree.

However, what I can tell at this moment is that the issue of North Korea's nuclear weapons had become an issue in North Korean society and, in particular, among North Korean diplomatic officials since 1985.

It was at this time that a soundless rumor that "something will happen soon" began to spread among diplomats telepathically. The remark that "what good Stalin did was the timely development and possession of atomic bombs" also circulated among the people.

Up until the early 1980's, North Korean diplomats thought that the economic might of North and South Korea was nearly the same. However, they began to clearly realize during the 1985-86 period that South Korea's superiority was certain. Thus, they began to feel a sense of defeat. At that time, the rumor "we cannot cope with this situation with conventional (classic) [preceding word published in English] weapons; therefore, nuclear weapons must be developed" circulated among diplomats. As the result, they could recover mental stability. Both the ruling class and other officials had the same feeling that the development of nuclear weapons was "the last means for preserving their political system."

At that time, a number of various technological delegations, including a team for designing atomic reactors, went from North Korea to France and returned home after "extracting" technology on atomic reactors. Concerning this, the North Korean diplomats observed that the North Korean authorities chose France and Austria as nations for collecting technology and intelligence required for development of nuclear weapons because

the restrictions on these countries by the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls [COCOM] were relatively "mild."

In particular, when the meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] was held in Austria last year, urgent telegrams and messages on the issue of nuclear inspection were delivered to the North Korean missions overseas one after another.

The contents of the messages were to encourage each mission to obtain support from each nation to oppose the big powers' nuclear monopolization and nuclear inspection.

Although the development of nuclear weapons became an issue among the diplomats in the mid-1980's, some people had already begun talking in whispers about nuclear weapons since the early part of the 1960's, much earlier than the time the diplomats made an issue of nuclear development.

In 1959, North Korea established a nuclear physics department at Kim Il-song University. With this as the beginning, North Korea also established a nuclear physics department in Kim Chaek Industrial College and set up underground nuclear research facilities in Pakchon, North Pyongan Province, in the middle 1960's.

At that time, Kim Il-song once asked, "Why do sons of the core officials go only to political and economics departments instead of nuclear physics?" He personally directed that "clever children from those core officials be sent to the nuclear physics department." As a result, a number of students applied for this department, "overflowing with the hope." After graduation, they all served in the Nuclear Research Institute in Pakchon. I heard that since they could not meet even their parents while working there, and since their visit to Pyongyang was not free, they harshly complained of this.

I heard the rumors, "if you go to the nuclear physics department, you will be a ghost of Pakchon" and "they have already produced atomic bombs" while I was attending the Pyongyang Foreign Language Institute during the 1965-72 period and while I was attending the Pyongyang Foreign Language College during the 1972-1977 period. Because the majority of the students attending these schools were sons of high-ranking North Korean officials, 80 to 90 percent of the rumors going around among them were accurate and correct.

Judging all this, it appears that North Korea began the development of nuclear weapons already in the middle part of the 1960's and that such development has been further accelerated since the economic gap between North and South Korea widened during the 1980's.

### **Defector Says North Produced Plutonium in 1987**

*SK3010062991 Seoul SEKYE ILBO in Korean  
30 Oct 91 p 1*

[Report on article by Kim Chong-min, former North Korean official who defected to the South in 1988: "North Korea Succeeds in Producing Raw Material for Nuclear Weapons in 1987"]

[Text] With inspection of North Korea's nuclear facilities emerging as a topic of international concern, testimony coming out that North Korea already in 1987 had achieved success at its nuclear reprocessing facility in the separation and extraction of plutonium, raw material used in the production of nuclear weapons, is drawing attention.

Kim Chong-min (age 48) participated in the construction of Yongbyon's nuclear development facilities when he was in charge of the material and supply section of the Ministry of Public Security [MPS]. He defected to South Korea in 1988. He revealed on 29 October his above recollections concerning North Korea's nuclear development as well as facts concerning the power struggle surrounding Kim Il-song and Kim Chong-il.

Kim is the highest-ranking defector to come to South Korea from the North Korean Government. In the first installment of a series contributed by Kim to the SEKYE ILBO under his own name, Kim notes: "I know that North Korea completed construction and has been operating a 30,000-kilowatt research reactor since 1987." He adds: "I also heard from a responsible person who at the time supervised at the Yongbyon nuclear facility that by the end of 1987, North Korea would also put into operation a nuclear reprocessing facility and be capable of separating and extracting around 15 kilograms of plutonium annually."

Kim was the deputy director of the material supply agency subordinate to the Engineering Department of the MPS from the early 1980s through 1987. While working there, he was in charge of directly supplying materials needed by the Yongbyon nuclear facility in North Pyongan Province.

He states that he was able to hear information concerning the Yongbyon nuclear facility because he was active at the construction site of the Yongbyon facility as a high-level cadre capable of maintaining secrecy.

While making such statements, Kim insists that it is possible that North Korea already has developed a small-scale nuclear weapon, although he did not ascertain any firm supporting evidence that could be used as international proof of this claim.

Kim also notes the reasons for North Korea establishing the Yongbyon area as a nuclear development area, which include: it weakened U.S. forces capabilities to detect the facility; the area was conducive to construction of underground nuclear reprocessing facilities since there are virtually no industrial structures in the area; since almost

no civilians reside in the area, secrecy can easily be maintained; and a winding river which separates Yongbyon-kun from the rest of the area essentially makes it an island.

Kim defected to South Korea on 1 May 1988 from Western Europe through Moscow, Berlin, and finally

Bangkok, Thailand, before reaching Korea. At the time of his defection, he was serving as the president of the Taeyang Trading Company, a directly-managed enterprise of the Workers Party of Korea Cadre Department. A key figure in a so-called foreign currency earning enterprise, Kim was in charge of trade in uranium and cobalt in areas such as Africa.

## BULGARIA

### Disagreement About Origin of Arms Shipment

#### BTA Says Ship Loaded in Italy

AU2310195691 Sofia BTA in English 1820 GMT  
23 Oct 91

["Greek Cypriot Ship Was Freightened in Italy"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, October 23 (BTA)—The Cypriot Greek ship, which was arrested in the Bosphorus yesterday morning with over 2,000 cases of arms and 4 tonnes of chemical substances used in drug production on board, [words indistinct] in Burgas, Mr. Khristo Kraychev, chief of the Interior Ministry Press Centre, told BTA. The Bulgarian side was not aware of what cargo the ship had on board.

The shipping documentation on the additionally freighted cargo is being checked with the assistance of Bulgarian Customs authorities.

The Turkish television reported that the documentation which was accompanying the cargo did not indicate the consignee and the crew was not unanimous about its final destination. According to the Turkish television, the vessel which was transiting through the Bosphorus was captured after a tip off. This is one of the largest ever intercepted cases of smuggling in the region.

#### Government: Cargo Loaded in Burgas

AU2310195991 Sofia BTA in English 1925 GMT  
23 Oct 91

[Text] Sofia, October 23 (BTA)—In connection with the reports in the mass media about the Turkish authorities arresting a ship in the Bosphorus which was smuggling weapons and was loaded at the Burgas Port, the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations made the following statement for the BTA:

"The ship called Cape Maleas was loaded in the Port of Burgas in implementation of an intergovernmental agreement. This is not a case of smuggled export but most probably of some misunderstanding between the Turkish authorities and the captain of the ship which we hope will be settled soon. As regards the "chemical substances" on board the ship the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations declares that no such cargo was loaded in Burgas."

#### Kozloduy Nuclear Plant 6th Reactor Repaired

AU0910141391 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network  
in Bulgarian 1400 GMT 9 Oct 91

[Text] The repair of the sixth reactor of the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant has been completed. The reactor is expected to be activated late tonight or tomorrow morning [10 October].

The 1,000-megawatt fifth reactor will be reloaded with nuclear fuel and can be activated at the earliest after one month.

### Havel Rejects Allegations of Arms Exports to Burma

LD2110224391 Prague CSTK in English 2112 GMT  
21 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Prague Oct 21 (CSTK)—Responding to U.S. State Department allegations that heavy armaments are being exported from Czechoslovakia to Burma, Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel today told CSTK that for five years Czechoslovakia has not delivered any arms to the southeast Asian nation.

Earlier today Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry spokesman Egon Lansky said no weapons have been legally exported from Czechoslovakia to Burma, but added that a Czechoslovak firm may have illegally offered arms to Burma's ruling junta.

Havel also said Czechoslovakia's new screening law needs to be amended before being implemented. [passage omitted]

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

### Report of Attempt To Sell Arms to Burma

#### Sale Said Thwarted

AU2310161891 Prague LIDOVE NOVINY in Czech  
21 Oct 91 p 8

["r"-signed report: "Arms for Burma?"]

[Text] Prague—The president's spokesman Michal Zantovsky told us yesterday that he does not know anything about any sale of Czechoslovak weapons to Burma. P. Cernocky, spokesman for the Federal Ministry of Foreign Trade, told us that all questions concerning arms exports must be submitted in writing and that the ministry would reply to them within two to three days.

According to information that we obtained from sources at the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a certain Slovak firm tried to offer to sell some arms systems to various countries, including Burma. The Czechoslovak Embassy in Burma intercepted the letter of offer, and the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not recommend the sale. Shortly thereafter, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, too, confirmed the halt of the sale. It follows from the information that we have that the deal has not been carried out thus far. We continue our investigations.



**Ministry Makes Statement**

*AU2310150091 Prague LIDOVE NOVINY in Czech  
22 Oct 91 p 3*

["(LN)"]-signed report: "No Arms From a Legal Point of View"]

[Excerpt] Prague—At a news conference held in the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry in Prague yesterday, Foreign Ministry Press Spokesman Egon Lansky denied claims made by the U.S. State Department that the CSFR has sold arms to the ruling junta in Burma.

"We have enough evidence to be able to claim that Czechoslovakia has not legally supplied arms to Burma during the past five years," he stressed. However, he admitted that arms could have been exported illegally from the CSFR. He stated that "there is, allegedly, a Czechoslovak company offering arms," but, as he again stressed, this has not yet been absolutely verified. An embargo has been imposed on arms supplies to Burma, and Czechoslovakia fully respects this, he added. [passage omitted]

**Romania Denies Supplying Army With Arms, Equipment**

*LD1710160391 Belgrade TANJUG in English  
1446 GMT 17 Oct 91*

[Text] Bucharest, Oct 17 (TANJUG)—The Romanian Defence Ministry today denied allegations reappearing in the Slovenian and Polish media that Romania has been selling surface-to-surface missiles, vehicles for the transportation of these missiles and other military equipment to the Yugoslav People's Army (YPA).

The ministry described the allegations as pure lie and provocation, intended to aggravate good neighbourly relations in the Balkans, particularly the traditionally stable and friendly relations between Romania and Yugoslavia.

The Romanian Defence Ministry said the Romanian Army and military industry were strictly abiding by the stand of the Romanian Government and respecting the embargo on arms deliveries to any of the sides in the conflict in Yugoslavia.

Romanian Foreign Ministry Spokesman Traian Chebeleu last night also denied the respective allegations and expressed dissatisfaction with a statement by Slovenian Information Minister Jelko Kacin, according to which the "Yugoslav Army, in cooperation with the Romanian Army, has purchased 54 vehicles for the transportation of surface-to-surface missiles".

**Traffickers Planned To Buy Arms for Croatia**

*LD1610130191 Belgrade TANJUG in English  
1216 GMT 16 Oct 91*

[Text] Madrid, October 16 (TANJUG)—Four arms traffickers who were arrested in Malaga a few days ago had

been planning illegally to purchase tanks, rocket launchers, mortars and large quantities of ammunition for Croatia, it was disclosed in Madrid today.

Two Croats and two Austrian citizens had been negotiating the arms purchase with the Spanish office of the English firm Commerce International group, which is based in San Pedro de Alcantara, near Malaga, as learned.

This English firm "was active also during the Iraq-Iran war, and also during other regional armed conflicts," the Spanish press reports today.

The four men were arrested at Malaga Airport as they were planning to return to London. The arms dealers' baggage was found to contain 130,000 dollars, 70,000 German marks, arms catalogues, and contracts on arms purchases.

The men have been detained in prison and will most probably be charged not only with attempting to take hard currency out of the country illegally, but also with arms trafficking.

**Croatia, South Africa Said To Produce Missiles**

*AU1410184291 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network  
in Serbo-Croatian 1100 GMT 14 Oct 91*

[Text] Tudjman Receiving Nuclear Weapons—That is the headline in today's VECERNJE NOVOSTI in connection with the information that Croatia and South Africa have agreed to produce nuclear missiles. The paper learned from the Ruder Boskovic Institute that a group of physicists has received the order from Bansk Dvori to work on technological solutions for small-scale nuclear arms. Ivic notes that Hrvoje Sarlic, one of Tudjman's aides, was given the special mission to use illegal connections in South Africa to obtain the materials for producing nuclear arms, which Croatia lacks.

**Documents Show Chemical Weapons Sent to Iraq**

*AU0910192291 Paris AFP in English 1830 GMT  
9 Oct 91*

[Text] Paris, Oct 9 (AFP)—Yugoslavia provided chemical warfare factories and weapons to Iraq, and some of its Army units in Serbia are also due to receive "chemically-tipped" rockets by the end of November, the MIDDLE EAST DEFENSE NEWS publication reported here.

The twice-monthly newsletter quoted extensively from what it said were documents made available by the Office of the Federal President of Yugoslavia, noting that the Federal Army had begun to equip combat forces in Serbia with the rocket launching system in June.

Giving details of the documents, the newsletter quoted sources at the office of the president as saying: "Yugoslavia is responsible for supplying Iraq with the technology to produce Sarin chemical weapons in 1986 and

was instrumental in the construction of a chemical factory for the same weapon between the years 1983 and 1985."

The Unis Associated Metal Industry of Sarajevo received an order in December 1987 from the al-Qaqaa [spelling as received] State Establishment for propellant powder to be used in the manufacture of 130 mm artillery charges, and another order dated June 13 1988. Some of the documents referred to the plant as being at al-Iskandariyah.

The publication said that the Sarin plant was probably the al-Muthena [spelling as received] State Establishment south west of Samarra.

Yugoslavia also provided the design for manufacture in Iraq of a rocket launcher system designated in Yugoslav inventories as the M87. "Each launch vehicle can ripple fire 12 262 mm rockets, which were designed from the

start to carry chemical warfare agents," MEDNEWS said. The first two unassembled launchers were shipped to Iraq in 1988, it said.

The report went on to say that "the Yugoslav firms Bratstvo and Zrak also built a 122 mm Howitzer factory near al-Fallujah, code-named KOL7-Sa'd 5. The Iraqis refer to this plant as the Saddam State Establishment."

Yugoslav factories continue to manufacture the M87 rocket launchers, it said, with the Yugoslav Federal Army in June this year installing one M87 battery it had initially purchased for training at the Zadar military academy "in combat positions near Cuprija in central Siberia." [sentence as received] The purchase order was doubled to eight launchers and two control units, and delivery was scheduled to take place on September 25 1991, the report said.

"In addition," the Mednews report concluded, "Yugoslav units located near Kragujevac in central Serbia are slated to receive more than 2,000 chemically-tipped rockets for the M87 by the end of November."

**ARGENTINA****Guinea-Bissau President Discusses Arms Sales***PY2310223291 Buenos Aires BUENOS AIRES  
HERALD in English 23 Oct 91 p 15*

[From the "Argentina in Brief" column]

[Text] (DYN)—The president of Guinea-Bissau, Joao Bernardo Vieira, met yesterday with Argentine Defence Minister Erman Gonzalez to analyze the possible sale of war material to the West African nation. They also considered the implementation of a military training scheme for middle-ranking personnel of that nation. The foreign leader, who arrived on an official five-day tour last Monday [21 October], said he would also visit some military units. For his part, Gonzalez said his ministry would help to "modernize the armed forces of that country within a democratic system." He also offered to send a mission to study the specific military needs of Guinea-Bissau. In the afternoon, General Vieira attended a meeting organized by the Buenos Aires Provincial Bank, where he spoke for some 200 businessmen. He also met Argentine Foreign Minister Guido Di Tella.

**CNEA Signs Uranium Exploration Contract***PY1010165191 Buenos Aires NOTICIAS  
ARGENTINAS in Spanish 2045 GMT 9 Oct 91*

[Text] Buenos Aires, 9 Oct (NA)—It was officially reported here today that the National Commission for Atomic Energy [CNEA] signed a contract on 9 October with Nuclear Mendoza S.E. for the exploitation of the Sierra Pintada uranium mine.

The agreement includes services and activities that complement the running of the uranium concentrates production plant.

The contract will facilitate the resumption of uranium concentrate production, which is vital for the Atucha and Embalse nuclear plants.

The San Rafael Mining and Factory Complex, which is the richest uranium deposit in the country, will be reactivated within a few weeks.

**BRAZIL****Santana Views Results of IAEA Conference***92WP0005Z Sao Paulo GAZETA MERCANTIL  
in Portuguese 26 Sep 91 pp 1, 20*

[Article by Sao Paulo correspondent Luis Leonel]

[Text] The bilateral safeguards agreement signed by Brazil and Argentina two months ago in Guadalajara, Mexico permitting mutual verification of their nuclear facilities is encouraging countries that traditionally have stubbornly resisted any kind of inspection of their

nuclear facilities to agree to monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

South Africa signed the international safeguard documents last week during the IAEA's 35th annual conference. South Africa had been one of the countries that was viewed with mistrust by the international community for pursuing a nuclear program that was beyond the reach of any kind of control and, in theory, capable of producing nuclear warfare devices.

North and South Korea and the Middle Eastern nations, also firmly opposed to any monitoring of their nuclear plants until recently, are now discussing whether or not to accept the IAEA safeguards. "By their willingness to open their installations to international controls, (Brazil and Argentina are to sign international safeguards agreements in the next few months) the two countries have pointed others in the same direction," said Jose Luiz Santana de Carvalho, president of the National Commission for Nuclear Energy (CNEN), who presided over the IAEA conference this year.

Brazil and Argentina were considered as paradigms of countries that conducted nuclear programs with a view to strengthening their position on the regional scene. Military men in the two countries—traditional rivals in the economic and military fields—were accustomed to keeping their eyes on their neighbor and reporting every step taken, in order to demand funds from their own governments for covert investment in the nuclear area under the allegation of a need for "strategic security."

South Africa, isolated on the black African continent, resorted to the same sort of argument. Likewise, the instability of the Middle East made that argument readily acceptable to the governments of Israel and the Arab countries. South Korea also competed with its neighbor to the north in boosting investments in the nuclear area and in keeping secret what it was doing.

The suspicion hanging over all those countries was that they were pursuing nuclear programs that had a military objective.

"By signing the IAEA safeguards conditions, they have dispelled that suspicion," Santana said. Brazil, along with Argentina, was supposed to have signed the international agency's safeguards papers during the 35th Conference. "We were ready to sign, but members of the agency were still studying the model version we were going to use," Santana explained. Brazil and Argentina, unlike other signatories to IAEA safeguards, are submitting their facilities to inspection but keeping their technological, industrial, and commercial secrets intact. Santana gave assurances that signature of the IAEA international safeguards by the two countries should occur before the end of the year.

Inspectors from the agency will monitor the nuclear materials processed by Brazil and their fuel cycle, but not inspect the machinery and equipment that perform that operation. It is as if they will examine the raw uranium

that enters Brazilian facilities and later, look at the enriched uranium that leaves them. From the degree of enrichment and the quality of the material produced, they can determine whether Brazil is capable of making, or is making, devices for warfare. Brazil enriches uranium to 20 percent at the Aramar center in Ipero, Sao Paulo State, which belongs to the Navy. Uranium has to be enriched to 90 percent to make a nuclear bomb.

This type of safeguard creates a demilitarized zone in South America in terms of nuclear weapons. Signing of a similar commitment by South Africa (without restrictions, since there the controls also cover technological, industrial, and commercial aspects) creates a peace zone in Africa. The next step is to create demilitarized zones in the Middle East and on the Korean peninsula.

The nations of the Middle East—except Iraq—will also adopt a special safeguards model. IAEA members are debating what that model will be like. The two Koreas are discussing the terms of their respective safeguards under the IAEA aegis. "In less than a year, regions that have been refusing for more than 30 years to sign the agency safeguards are demilitarizing themselves," said Santana. "This is an historic conference."

Of the countries that traditionally have been reluctant to agree to the IAEA safeguards, only India and Pakistan are still resisting the idea. "These are the called balls," Santana said in a reference to pool, where the called ball is the next one to fall into the pocket. According to him, neither of the two countries are yet talking about signing the energy use commitment that would place their nuclear facilities under international control but, "international pressure will soon force them into it."

The 80 members of the Conference passed a motion condemning Iraq for developing and using nuclear weapons. They demanded that Iraq submit both its official and parallel facilities to international controls. Another important decision by the conference was to admit the Baltic countries (Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia) as permanent members of the IAEA.

Brazil was selected to preside over the 35th Conference (held in Vienna, Austria, from 16-20 September) because of the importance in the demilitarization process of the commitments signed jointly with Argentina. "All the delegates stressed the importance of the Brazil/Argentina accords in reducing regional tensions," the CNEN president explained.

Negotiations between Brazil and Argentina in the nuclear field began during ex-President Jose Sarney's administration, when he visited Argentina and toured its nuclear plant at Embalse, in Cordoba Province, accompanied by then-President of Argentina Raul Alfonsin. Soon afterward, Alfonsin came to Brazil to see its nuclear facilities. Secrets that both countries had always kept under lock and key were beginning to come to light.

On 28 November 1990, President Fernando Collor signed a document that established a nuclear book-keeping system between the two countries. Three months later France, and then China, expressed intentions to sign the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

#### Technology Transfer Control Bill Debated

92SM0006A Sao Paulo EXAME in Portuguese 4 Sep 91 pp 26-27

[Text] President Fernando Collor de Mello has apparently reached an unfavorable conclusion about the results of the effort to move closer to the rich countries which has been under way since his government took office. In a meeting with foreign correspondents in Brasilia last week, Collor made an objective diagnosis of the policy of good neighborly relations with the developed world. "Whenever we pay one of the bills we receive from the First World, something happens, and a new obstacle arises to prevent investments and the transfer of technology," the president told the journalists. Despite this negative assessment, the government is planning to send to the National Congress another draft law which would require that we meet the demands of the rich countries. As has already happened in the cases of the Data-Processing Law and the draft law calling for the establishment of a new patent code which would recognize foreign patents in all sectors, the government is in this case making a point of adapting Brazil's commercial legislation to the norms which govern the sale of products involving sophisticated technologies, especially those which might be used in the manufacture of armaments.

With this undertaking, the government is attempting to create conditions which will make it easier for foreign enterprises to pass on modern technologies, either by licensing Brazilian industries, or directly, through their subsidiaries established in this country. The initiative suggesting the establishment of these legal norms came from the American Government. By means of a memorandum, Washington proposed that Brazilian legislation be brought into line with the norms which govern the Coordinating Committee on Export Controls (COCOM), as well as other informal agreements established among the rich countries to limit sales of technology which might have military uses (see section headed "From Ideology to Trade" below). If the draft law the government is preparing is approved by the Congress, measures calling for the licensing of exports and control over the import and reexport of equipment will be adopted. In exchange, Brazil will be granted easier terms for trade in products by means of a system of prior licensing or speedy handling.

The matter has been under discussion in an interministerial commission which includes representatives of the Itamaraty Palace, the Ministry of Economy, the Secretariat of Science and Technology, and the Armed Forces General Staff. Appointed more than three months ago,

this commission has already held seven meetings. The next to the last, with a group of businessmen, was held on 5 August at the Maksoud Plaza Hotel in Sao Paulo. From what transpired at that meeting, and also based on the debates within the government itself in recent months, it is possible to predict that the adoption of the trade controls suggested by the Americans will become a polemic issue in the National Congress, as well.

### Two Positions

In reality, the polemic argument which has developed about the proposal reveals the existence of two positions. On the one hand, there are those who urge that Brazil's legislation be brought into line with the international norms already in existence, because they believe that this initiative will facilitate the transfer of technology. On the commission, this is the position of the representatives of the Ministry of Economy and the Secretariats of Science and Technology and Strategic Affairs. "There will not be difficulties created pertaining to the import or export of high technology, because these difficulties already exist," Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology Edson Machado says. "The new legislation will only establish yet another bureaucracy for products which may have double uses." In other words, only those products with possible military applications will come under control.

On the other side, there are the government and business leaders who are concerned about the repercussions which, if approved, the draft law might have on technological development, and even on trade operations. Admiral Mario Cesar Flores, the naval minister, who is responsible for coordinating the proposal on the construction of the nuclear submarine, is opposed to the definition of more inclusive norms for the technological sector. "Frankly, I view the general restrictions such as the COCOM urges with displeasure," this minister says. "The pressure being exerted on Brazil to adopt these rules is very great." Flores says that 10 years ago, when he was still a rear admiral, there was a similar suggestion that Brazil impose restrictions on trade in technology. "Already in that era, our position was one of opposition to general rule agreements which extrapolate from the specific items being transferred," Flores says. "If the technology needed for missile gyroscopes is being received, for example, the restrictions should pertain to the use of that technology, and not to something else, such as nuclear technology."

Like the minister, the businessmen who attended the meeting in Sao Paulo also evidenced concern about the adoption of specific legislation for the technology trade. "There is increasing control over the transfer of trade in technologies, based on the alleged need to safeguard world security, which is threatened by countries like Iraq," Antonio Prestefelippe Neto, the director of Renner Herrmann, the Renner group's holding company for dye enterprises, says. "This argument, however, is just a pretext for controlling the market." This reasoning is supported by the fact that with the globalization of the economy and with all nations opening up commercially,

the developed nations have lost interest in selling technologies to the developing countries. "They prefer to sell finished products," Prestefelippe Neto says.

The pressures being exerted on Brazil are justified in part by the past ventures undertaken by domestic businesses and scientists in countries such as Iraq. This was the case with the advice provided by Brigadier General Hugo Piva to the regime of Saddam Husayn on the development of medium-range missiles. The revelation of this fact during the war in the Persian Gulf at the end of last year resulted in Brazil's inclusion on a kind of blacklist maintained by the developed countries. According to one member of the interministerial commission which is discussing the adoption of restrictions on trade in technologies, the American Government recently suspended its authorization for the import of dyes produced in Brazil because the manufacturer had previously done business with Iraq. The same thing happened, also during the first half of this year, with the attempts on the part of the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) to arrange the import of laboratory equipment. The explanation given by the American Government when it denied the request was that one of the institutes which would be receiving the equipment is engaged in research in the field of nuclear engineering.

### A Vague Concept

In the view of those in the government who approve of the adoption of more restrictive norms, there would be no reason for concern. "The new regulations are merely intended to provide a Brazilian response to the international community, so that the obstacles encountered to date can be overcome," the deputy director of the Department of Industry and Trade at the Ministry of Economy, Francisco Marcelo, says. "The issue is a law designed to let the great powers know that the country is exerting some control over those products which may have military uses," Edson Machado says. The problem is that the controls suggested by the developed nations do not have to do only with gunsights or missile-launching systems, for example. The items on the list subject to restrictions range from the semiconductors used in the electronics industry to mechanical valves which can be used in ultracentrifuges for processing uranium. "The concept delimiting which technologies are for civilian or military use is something which it is very difficult to define," the economist Mauro Arruda, a former president of the National Institute of Industrial Property and one of the experts consulted by the Itamaraty Palace on the drafting of the proposal on trade in technologies, comments. "The risk involved is that we may accept restrictions, as has already been happening, which have more economic and commercial than strategic and military effects."

In the opinion of the majority of the businessmen who expressed opinions at the meeting in Sao Paulo, it is more a question of insisting on negotiations with the developed countries than of drafting laws for which it

will be difficult, overall, to get approval in the Congress. "We must learn from the Orientals, who face the same restrictions but are able to bide their time and who yield only on superficial aspects, not what is essential," Prestefelippe says. "Brazilian businessmen need to be ready to provide foreign suppliers of technology with counterparts," businessman Giordano Romi, one of the owners of Romi, which manufactures operating machines in Santa Barbara d'Oeste, in the interior of Sao Paulo, says. "If they succeed in developing technologies, Brazilian enterprises can greatly increase the bargaining power they have in negotiations with foreign industries."

President Collor has indicated concern about the technology issue. Without a significant advance in this area, he maintains, the gap which separates the rich countries from the poor ones will widen. In this regard, Collor reflects the thinking expressed by the French writer Jean-Christophe Rufin, the author of the book "The Empire and the New Barbarians." "In this book, we see that the rich countries are becoming ever richer and more encapsulated within their own club," Ambassador Marcos Coimbra, secretary general of the presidency, says. Collor liked Rufin's argument so much that he gave this writer an audience at the Planalto Palace two weeks ago. What Rufin thinks about the restrictions on the marketing of technologies is not known, but it is probable that Collor shares with Jose Goldemberg, who is now a minister, the belief that on this issue, the easiest path toward ensuring free access is, indeed, acceptance of the controls.

#### Center and Periphery

How does French writer Jean-Christophe Rufin, who recently had an interview with President Collor at the Planalto Palace, perceive the world in his book "The Empire and the New Barbarians"?

- The end of the East-West confrontation has minimized the strategic interest of the developed world in the developing countries. What was previously known as the Third World was seen as a pawn on the chessboard on which the West was playing the game against communism.
- In the economic sector, modern technology is increasingly able to do without the raw materials and the items produced in the South, the old Third World.
- There would appear to be a trend toward isolation of the rich world from the poor and backward South, with what is happening outside the boundaries of the North being viewed as a secondary problem.
- For the future, this writer foresees three possibilities: either world apartheid, justified by the need to defend and protect the values which prevail in the rich world; solidarity, based on the conviction that it is not possible to build an enduring peace on a base of inequality; and the emergence of a radical Third World movement.

#### From Ideology to Trade

Agreements were signed by the developed countries to limit the access of the socialist bloc to Western technologies. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Gulf War, these agreements have been used in the relations between the rich countries and the underdeveloped ones.

- The Committee for the Coordination of Multilateral Export Controls is made up of all of the countries belonging to NATO except Iceland. The committee drafts lists of products for which there are restrictions on sales. The list is a long one, and it includes items ranging from military equipment and nuclear technology to microchips, semiconductors, and parts for the mechanical industry.
- The Australian Group, which was organized in 1984, imposes barriers pertaining to technologies and products which could be used in the manufacture of chemical weapons.
- MTCR—Missile Technology Control Regime—established in 1987, calls for controls on the sale of equipment and technology which could be used in the construction of rockets. In 1989, the French Government took this agreement as its basis for halting the transfer of technology called for in the negotiations between the Embratel [Brazilian Telecommunications Company] and Arianespace.

#### Companies Participated in Iraqi Nuclear Projects

PY0402148 Rio de Janeiro O GLOBO in Portuguese  
3 Oct 91 p 24

[Text] Sao Jose dos Campos—At least two Sao Paulo companies have sold material and metalworking services to Iraq's nuclear program. These companies obtained technology developed for the Brazilian nuclear program through a cooperation agreement signed with Germany in 1975. These companies were sought out by German industrial companies which had sold equipment, technology, and materials to build nuclear powerplants in Iraq.

According to Brazilian military officers who kept an eye on deals between Brazil and Iraq, Brazil's military industry was not involved in these deals. These military officers admitted that Brazil helped out Iraq's nuclear development efforts 10 years ago but deny any recent involvement. This assistance was limited to the sales of uranium concentrated restricted by international surveillance.

Brigadier Hugo Piva, the only Brazilian known to have been working with Iraq [as published], has stated that neither he nor his group of 21 engineers have been involved in nuclear or nuclear weapons projects for the Iraqi Government.

The Brazilian Foreign Ministry has indicated that it has not been officially notified of the results of the UN mission in Iraq. Thus, it refused to comment on the subject.

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

**South Asian Nation Calls Bush Plan 'Machiavellian'**

92WP0017D Islamabad *THE MUSLIM in English*  
2 Oct 91 p 6

[Article by Shireen M. Mazari]

[Text] Since the sixties, with the spread of nuclear technology, the Americans have attempted to institute nuclear nonproliferation while ensuring the preservation of their nuclear-weapons advantage globally and bilaterally against the Soviet Union. Hence, one saw the evolution of the multilateral Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) and the Nonproliferation Treaty, and the bilateral Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, the Vladivostok Protocols, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) to name just a few.

The latest Bush pronouncements also fits into this framework, with the Americans well aware of the fact that any hint of nuclear arms cuts/disarmament will be met with global approval. Of course, the latest pronouncements are also a means of legitimizing the new world order by attempting to cover up the military foundations of this order. Even this would be tolerable if the proposed actions were to truly lead to nuclear disarmament, rather than merely being one more phase in the number-crunching game of arms control and disarmament that has underlain so many existing international arrangements.

In order to understand the reality beyond the latest Bush plan, one must move past the propaganda and the media blitz accompanying the pronouncement as well as the welcome it received at the declaratory level from world leaders.

I. According to the Bush plan, the United States will bring home all of ground-based short-range missiles. This is something the Americans would have needed to do in any case, since these were primarily meant for use in a European theater of operations. With the changes in Eastern Europe, and specifically with the reunification of Germany, it made no economic and military sense to keep these weapons. So there is nothing altruistic in this objective which is part of cost-efficiency and defence rationalization rather than a major arms reduction move.

II. Again, according to the same plan, the United States will remove all tactical nuclear weapons, including nuclear cruise missiles, from surface ships and attack submarines as well as nuclear weapons associated with land-based naval aircraft. While a number of these weapons will be destroyed, some will be stored.

At first glance, this would seem to be a move towards genuine nuclear disarmament. However, it is still not clear how a weapon, especially one that is sea-based

(hence mobile in a way) can be definitively characterized as tactical or strategic. A lot depends upon the positioning of the weapon—that is, from where it will be launched.

The fact that the Americans intend to keep their strategic sea-based systems shows their desire to maintain a substantive nuclear capability. As for the claim that the United States will remove nuclear weapons associated with land-based naval aircraft, again this leaves the strategic nuclear weapons on board the sea-based naval aircraft. Finally, the idea that only some of these weapons will be destroyed means that the rest can be brought out of storage whenever the Americans choose.

III. The Bush plan also claims that American strategic bombers will be removed from day-to-day alert status and will return their weapons to storage.

This is perhaps the most cosmetic of the Bush plan components, since the existence of these weapons will not be undermined. Removing them from this alert status only signifies that the Americans do not feel a security compulsion to maintain this high level of readiness which involves heavy costs.

IV. As for the point about the removal from alert status of all U.S. intercontinental ballistic weapons already scheduled to be deactivated under the START—START still left 9,000 strategic warheads each permissible for retention by the United States and the Soviet Union: all that this will do is lessen the time-frame for implementation of the provisions of the Treaty.

V. The decision to scrap plans to put the 10-warhead MX missile on rail cars and to develop a mobile launcher for the single-warhead "midget-man" missile, as well as to cancel the nuclear short-range attack missile, merely reflects economic constraints. No doubt, the Americans have decided to channelize funds into the Strategic Defence Initiative which has not been totally abandoned. As it is, the Americans themselves have been debating the whole issue of the appropriate basing-mode for the MX missile, and short-range attack missiles also make little sense in the changed security environment, especially in Europe.

For conflicts like the Gulf, modern, conventional PGMs (precision-guided munitions) are now acknowledged as being extremely efficient and cost-effective. Thus, the Americans can play the role of regional overlords without the need for short-range nuclear weapons.

VI. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Bush plan is the decision to create a new U.S. strategic command, designed to improve command and control of all U.S. strategic and nuclear forces. The criticality of strengthening and streamlining the C3I (Command, Control, Communication & Intelligence) has been a major preoccupation of American strategists for over two decades. The latest pronouncement in this regard clearly reflects the American belief in the continuing viability of nuclear weapons and the focus seems to be on rationalizing a

combined conventional-nuclear military doctrine keeping in mind the new global imperatives of American policy.

In summation, therefore, the Bush plan has little to offer in concrete terms of nuclear disarmament. The real purpose seems to be to try and evolve a new means of pressurizing potential nuclear-weapons States into renouncing their nuclear capabilities. Hence, the emphasis in the plan on short-range and tactical nuclear weapons—the sort these States would most likely be in a position to produce. Unlike the use of coercive means like the Pressler Amendment, the Bush plan has the immense propaganda value of seeming to adopt a high moral ground on the issue of nuclear weapons.

Of course, by putting forth this plan, the Americans are also distracting attention away from efforts to eliminate conventional weapons of mass destruction—including chemical and biological weapons. Surely, a unilateral U.S. move in this field would have been a welcome step!

Interestingly enough, while the French and British have ostensibly welcomed the Bush plan, they have not come up with plans to destroy their own nuclear arsenals—except those that have become redundant. It seems as if they have managed to retain their realpolitik approach while lending declaratory support to their ally—or, perhaps, they understand the Machiavellian nature of the Bush plan. Is not it about time countries like Pakistan also understood this?

#### **U.S. Seen Reviving Agreement With Pakistan**

92WO0017B *Secunderabad DECCAN CHRONICLE*  
in English 24 Sep 91 p 8

[Text] Many politicians in the United States seem to be sold on the idea that Pakistan does need a nuclear deterrent against India. Reports about the Bush Administration's supposed willingness to accommodate Pakistan on the nuclear issue continue to appear in American newspapers. President George Bush has to issue a certification under the Pressler Law that Pakistan's nuclear programme is geared to peaceful purposes. The United States belatedly suspended military aid to Pakistan last year because of noncertification by Mr Bush regarding Islamabad's nuclear plan. Under the Pressler Amendment, the U.S. President is not embarking on the manufacture of nuclear weapons. But the non-certification last year did not deter Islamabad from going ahead with its plan to make atomic weapons. As if to defy the United States, Pakistan Atomic Energy Chairman Munir Ahmed Khan said, a few months after the Presidential action, that his country would not compromise its position on nuclear programme at any cost. No wonder the U.S. intelligence agencies later gathered information which suggested that Pakistan had built a least six atomic bombs. The entire world knows that Pakistan has for over a decade now been single-mindedly pursuing its unsafeguarded nuclear activity. This has inevitably triggered a demand in India that it should keep its nuclear options open to meet any nuclear threat from Pakistan.

There was a time—that was in the mid-eighties—when Pakistan made no bones about its nuclear intentions. It changed its nuclear tune only when the Reagan Administration threatened to suspend all aid to it if it did not abandon the plan to make nuclear weapons. That was the time when the United States needed a foothold in this part of the world to help the Afghan rebels to fight the Soviet troops in their country.

The late Gen Zia, who was then in power, siphoned off much of the U.S. arms aid to the rebels and diverted it to the border with India. The Afghan crisis is now over. And the international relations have undergone dramatic changes in recent months. Thanks to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States has now emerged as the only superpower in the world. The United States has a special relationship with Pakistan, with the global context changing in favor of the United States, one is unable to understand the justification for the reported American move to revive the suspended 1959 defense agreement, which assures Pakistan of full protection against external aggression. But there is no known threat to Pakistan's security. If there is such a threat it could be, according to Pakistani leaders, only from India over the Kashmir Issue! All this is a gross distortion of the realities in the sub-continent.

The reported U.S. move to provide a "defense umbrella" to Pakistan is unwarranted. What use Pakistan made of the American arms aid in the past is well known. Right now Pakistan—it would be truer to say the Pakistani Army—appears to be spoiling for a military adventure against India over the Kashmir issue. The United States, which has commendably taken the stand in favor of resolving the Kashmir issue in the spirit of the Simla accord, would be ill-advised to start another bout of arms build-up by Pakistan. More arms aid to Pakistan would only mean an intensification of the arms race in the sub-continent that is threatening to acquire a nuclear dimension. Pakistan is already in possession of enough arms to foil any threat to it. The United States would do well to dissuade Islamabad from making more nuclear weapons.

#### **U.S. Shows Balanced Perspective in Amendment**

92WP0017A *Bangalore DECCAN HERALD* in English  
20 Sep 91 p 8

[Text] The decision of the joint committee of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to keep India out of the Pressler Amendment's reach is obviously good news for New Delhi, which has never been enthusiastic about the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). The panel in effect toned down the ominous implications of the Lagomarsino Amendment approved by the House of Representatives last June. This equated India with Pakistan and required the U.S. President to submit an annual report to Congress certifying that India has not been developing nuclear weapons for aid flows to continue, as he is required to do in the case of Pakistan under the Pressler law.



India's adversarial relationship with China, a nuclear power, and Pakistan, which has acquired nuclear capability, have always come in the way of its readily surrendering its nuclear options. India also thinks that unilateral restraints on newer nuclear powers without countervailing sacrifices by pre-NPT nuclear powers are unfair. There has not been much evidence of rethinking on this score. India has also found the Pressler Amendment particularly invidious because the military and economic aid Pakistan receives in comparison is much higher than the insignificant amount of economic aid India receives from the United States. An identical penalty could well have been construed as an unnecessary display of hostility by the United States towards India.

The joint committee, however, has reversed a trend that was set in the House of Representatives by powerful anti-Indian lobbying. It might be recalled that even in June the U.S. State Department had said that similar curbs on India were not being contemplated, though it had talked of wanting to free Pakistan from the clutches of the Pressler Amendment. At the same time, there are good reasons for a change in the Indian stand. For one thing, events in the Soviet Union have strongly diluted the Moscow-New Delhi military understanding and the possibility of a realignment of forces has brightened.

The joint committee did not revive the proposal for the nonproliferation conference in obvious recognition of the changed context in which the countries of the region will not have superpower encouragement in future conflicts. The committee's conclusions were also in obvious conformity with the U.S.'s stated position that India and Pakistan must resolve the Kashmir issue bilaterally. Though the committee was largely responsible for restoring the balance in the U.S. perspective of the subcontinent that appeared to have been lost in the proceedings of the House of Representatives, an appreciation of India's role in South Asia was also discernible.

### **Regional 'Denuclearization' of South Asia Urged**

92WP0017C Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English  
28 Sep 91 p 6

[Article by Khalid Akhtar]

[Text] Lot of whispering is going around about Pakistan nuclear programme. It is evident that the Americans are closing in to perform the last act—make Pakistan sign the NPT [Nonproliferation Treaty].

The Americans have their way of getting things done. And with their tail high after their massive victory in the Gulf war and the crumbling down of the Soviet Empire—the only check on them—they have repeatedly implied in so many words that it would be an unwise proposition to defy their dictates.

There is no doubt that Pakistan has been under tremendous pressure from the United States on the nuclear issue. Some observers are of the view that Islamabad, if

not already knuckled down, is fast losing ground to maneuver itself out from a difficult situation.

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's proposal for a five-nation moot to free South Asia of nuclear arms was a good move, both in contents and perception, and gave Pakistan a chance to be treated equally with India, its arch adversary, in the nuclear field. All the quarters welcomed this proposal—even the United States finding no qualm to dispute it.

But the Capitol Hill has remained wielded to the idea that equating Pakistan with India would not be in the long term interest of the United States, notwithstanding the latter's close affinity and special relationship with Islamabad. Soon the United States moved deftly to ensure an edge for India over Pakistan in the nuclear field.

Recently the United States waived Pressler provision in case of India, entitling the latter to American aid without certification from President Bush that New Delhi does not possess the bomb. (The Pressler Amendment was extended to include India in June last and Islamabad considered it a major victory for its diplomacy.)

The Pressler provision applied to India gave an insight into Capitol Hill's thinking. It asked India to halt its nuclear programme at a stage—as it was in June 1991, thus giving Delhi the enormous benefit of retaining the gains of nuclear technology it has achieved over the years. India became a nuclear power way back in 1974 when it exploded an atomic device in the Rajasthan Desert. And make no mistake that since then India has come a long way in the nuclear field.

On the other hand the United States is not willing to allow Pakistan to retain the level of nuclear enrichment it has achieved. And even if the United States finally agrees to allow Islamabad to retain whatever it has attained in the nuclear field, India will come out as a clear gainer with a decisive edge in the nuclear armory.

There is a possibility that with this clear advantage in sight, India may after all agree to Nawaz Sharif's five-nation moot proposal to resolve the nuclear issue. Washington, indeed, appears to be working on these lines. There have been reports in the press that the United States plans to initiate talks with Delhi and Islamabad on the nuclear issue.

The real problem for the United States appears to be how to sort out the nuclear imbalance between India and China. Enjoying a clear advantage over India in the nuclear arsenal, China has already announced its willingness to sign the NPT. Both the United States and the Soviet Union would probably not like to leave India at a lurch in any nuclear arrangement.

This is a complex situation. What arrangements, if any, the United States has in mind to allay the Indian fears and make it sign the NPT, despite the substantial gap between the nuclear capabilities of the two countries, is

difficult to comprehend. That India will not settle for anything less than concrete provisions is beyond any doubt. The more important question, however, is that whether the United States has similar consideration for Pakistan while sorting out its nuclear dispute with India.

Islamabad has done well to establish its point that denuclearization of South Asia should be sought through a regional arrangement. Here Islamabad stands a chance to come out with a reasonably good bargain for itself. But much will depend on how Islamabad proceeds on the slippery road to denuclearization and how well it can stand up to the American pressure.

The U.S. bias against Pakistan is visible. It no longer feels that the UN resolutions on Kashmir remain valid documents. It supports the solution of the Kashmir issue, but on lines that suit the Indian interests. The United States will be no more fairer to Islamabad on the nuclear issue.

Of late Islamabad's position on the nuclear issue has become somewhat fluid. Reports have appeared in a section of the national press that the United States has offered to review and enlarge the 1959 bilateral treaty as a quid pro quo for Pakistan signing the NPT. The authenticity of the report has remained a matter of controversy. However, the government has not denied it categorically either. The government's silence could be due to the reason that it does not want to engage itself in a controversy on a sensitive matter.

There have been a spate of statements on the nuclear issue from various quarters. At times it has given an impression as if the nation's reaction is being gauged through calculated moves. Ms Bhutto, Cochairperson of the PPP [Pakistan People's Party], has been vocal, even rash, in her comments on Pakistan's nuclear front.

The suspension of the U.S. aid has started pinching Islamabad. The economic situation is bad, but not unmanageable. The IMF's willingness to release aid will provide some relief to Islamabad. But more important is the gesture. The IMF would not have opened its safe without a nod from Washington. Is this signal a change of heart on the part of Washington or a sign of submission on the part of Islamabad?

The American diplomacy is on the rampage, overcoming one resistance after another. Its defence pact with Kuwait, its plans to enter into similar type of arrangements with other states of the area, present a menacing scenario of Bush New World Order. Even a hard nut like Moammer Qaddafi of Libya and a staunch opponent Dr. Najib of Afghanistan, have started looking to the United States for favors.

A nuclear Pakistan will not fit in Bush New World Order. On the other hand, no matter how strongly Islamabad feels against the American order, it cannot defy it or remain cut off from it. The odds are heavy against Pakistan. Would Islamabad be able to continue to hang on to its cherished nuclear programme is a big

questions mark. It would be bad for the nation if it could not retain its nuclear programme which, in the existing regional environment, has become synonymous with Pakistan's integrity and sovereignty.

## EGYPT

### Israel 'Responsible' for Iran's Nuclear Program

NC1610085191 Cairo AL-AHRAM in Arabic 13 Oct 91  
p 7

[Editorial: "Iran's Nuclear Missiles and Mubarak's Initiative"]

[Text] An Israeli magazine recently published a report saying that Iran has succeeded in illegally procuring five tactical nuclear missiles from the Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan by exploiting the state of chaos that reigned in the Soviet Union in the wake of the failed August coup. The Israeli report indicated Iran has asked Israel to pull out of East Jerusalem and allow the Palestinians to establish their state.

Regardless of the report's details, it is true Iran indeed has managed to obtain a nuclear capability. It seems the infiltration by Israeli aircraft of several Arab countries' airspace and their overflights of Iraq represent a prelude to crossing Iraqi airspace to Iran. This could constitute an extremely serious factor in exacerbating tension in the region.

Israel should be held responsible for motivating Iran to obtain nuclear capability through all means because Israel keeps a huge nuclear arsenal and refuses any initiative to eliminate such weapons in return for imposing strict control on the nuclear programs of the region's states. Israel has refused even to submit its nuclear facilities to inspection, which has not prevented any state subjected to inspection from producing nuclear weapons if it so desires.

Everyone, including Iran, must deal with this issue with complete rationalism. We believe that implementing President Husni Mubarak's initiative, which calls for ridding the region of atomic weapons, represents the sole basis that would enable the region to live in peace because it guarantees the elimination of nuclear weapons from the region's states, including Israel and any other state possessing such weapons. President Mubarak's initiative also ensures strict control for halting any endeavors seeking to obtain nuclear weapons.

## INDIA

### Solanki: No U.S. Pressure To Sign Nuclear Pact

BK0610091391 Delhi All India Radio Network  
in English 0830 GMT 6 Oct 91

[Excerpt] The external affairs minister, Mr. Madahsinh Solanki, says there is no pressure from the United States on India to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

He, however, said that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told him during their meeting in New York that it will be good for India to sign the treaty, when France and China have expressed their willingness to sign it. Mr. Solanki said India's decision not to sign the treaty is independent, as it believes that the treaty tends to divide the world between the nuclear haves and havenots. He said unless there is equality among the signatories, there is no point in insisting on the treaty. Mr. Solanki reaffirmed that India is against the piling up of nuclear weapons and advocates their destruction. Mr. Solanki was speaking to newsmen at Delhi airport soon after his return from a two-week tour of Germany, Britain, Canada, and the United States. [passage omitted]

### Call for Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

*BK1810083991 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0730 GMT 18 Oct 91*

[Text] India has called for total elimination of all nuclear weapons, missile technology, and the export market for conventional weapons. Speaking at the United Nations' committee, the member of the Indian delegation, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, said the world cannot rid itself of the threat of nuclear weapons without a change in the attitude of the nuclear powers. He said the only way to eliminate all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons is to accept the action plan suggested by India to destroy these weapons in three phases spread over a period of 22 years.

### Plans To Use Thorium in Reactors Noted

*92WP0021A New Delhi PATRIOT in English 15 Sep 91 p 10*

[Text] Bombay, Sept 14 (UNI)—The Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC) is working on a scheme to introduce thorium along with uranium-plutonium mixed oxide, into one of the operating pressurised heavy water reactors (PHWRs) as part of its long range nuclear programme, to utilise thorium for power production.

The scheme is likely to come through within a year or two, according to BARC.

The Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) was also working on the design of an advanced heavy water reactor, which can retain the desirable features of RHWR, and at the same time optimise the system for thorium.

Two proposals were on the anvil for thorium utilisation in the near future, according to BARC.

Details about thorium utilisation in India's long range nuclear programme are contained in the latest newsletter of the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) published from here.

The first relatively large-scale introduction of thorium into power reactors will be seen in Narora-two, expected to go critical later this year, according to BARC.

Under the programme, 600 kg of thorium will be loaded into the initial core. It is expected to be a regular feature in future reactors, every reactor being initiated with a few hundred kg of thorium, according to the AERB newsletter.

India has large deposits of thorium. However, unlike uranium, it does not come with its own fissile material.

While this was an undoubted disadvantage to a young technology, in the present situation, it is out-weighed by its other advantages, according to BARC.

Large deposits of thorium and modest deposits of uranium in the country have dictated a three-stage nuclear power programme, with the ultimate objective of being able to sustain large power production based on thorium.

During the first stage, a series of PHWRs, which make efficient use of available natural uranium will be set up, according to BARC.

The second stage envisages rapid doubling of nuclear power capacity through the use of fast breeder reactors, based on plutonium, obtained in the first stage.

Once the size of the programme becomes large, sizable quantities of uranium-233 from thorium could be produced to start a series of thorium-U-233 fuelled reactors, which would form the third and final phase of the programme.

The first phase has reached the commercial stage, while the second phase has progressed to the design of a prototype. BARC is now proposing to start large-scale work on the thorium phase, according to BARC.

India's long-term strategy was to return to thermal reactors for the third phase, since the thorium converted into U-233 would help to keep the cycle going, without sizable inputs of external fissile material.

The energy potential of thorium in thermal reactors is way above that of natural uranium. India has nearly five times as much high-grade thorium as uranium, and the potential of thorium exceeds that of fast reactors. However, India had to depend on fast reactors for the first charge of U-233, says BARC.

The thorium-U-233 fuel cycle was of importance to India because of its nuclear fuel resource base. India had been making sustained progress towards the development of all aspects of thorium utilisation. There were some 'near-term' possibilities for enhancing the scale of thorium fuel cycle operations without affecting the ongoing programme, says BARC.

### Bengal Geologists Find Radioactive Minerals

*92WP0028A Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English 13 Sep 91 p 2*

[Text] Calcutta, Sept. 12—The geologists of Jadavpur University have recently discovered a radioactive mineral-rich zone in Purulia district of West Bengal.

Deposits of several rare earth minerals like quartz, feldspar, barite and fluorite have been found under the soil cover at Nawahatu village in the district.

Prof. J.N. Bhadra Chaudhury, member of the geology faculty of the university said most of these minerals are radioactive and exploration of the zone will help develop the superconductor industry in the country. He said mining of such minerals has been carried out for decades in the Purulia district but it was only recently that the geologists have confirmed the radioactivity of the minerals mined.

Prof Bhadra Chaudhury, who had submitted a paper on the study of radioactive minerals in Purulia at the 28th International Geological Congress held in Washington in 1989, said that the aim of his paper was to represent data on ore minerals, enriched with rare earth elements like thorium and uranium.

The scientists of Jadavpur University had collected samples from the village and examined those in laboratories. After analysis, the scientists came to the conclusion that the samples had high radioactivity. The microprobe analysis of these samples also confirmed presence of thorium, which is a radioactive mineral.

## IRAN

### Radio Condemns French Nuclear 'Assistance'

NC2410214791 (Clandestine) Voice of Mojahed  
in Persian 1630 GMT 24 Oct 91

[Text] The Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization [MKO] of Iran issued a statement on the Khomeyni regime's increased activity toward gaining access to nuclear weapons and vehemently condemned Deputy Foreign Minister Va'ez's visit to France.

A statement issued by the MKO office yesterday said that according to news agency reports, Va'ez, foreign minister of the mullahs ruling Iran and Velayati's deputy, arrived in Paris to obtain enriched uranium. Khomeyni's regime has been pressuring European countries for the past year for access to nuclear technology.

The statement says access to French enriched uranium is the No. 1 priority of the regime's nuclear program. The Khomeyni regime has riveted its attention on the PRC as well for gaining nuclear technology.

In conclusion, the MKO office stressed that when the regime's echelons are defending the atomic bomb as the most important strategic guarantee for their prolonged role in the region's future, any French assistance to this terrorist dictatorship will run counter to the Iranian people's interests and the peace and stability of this strategic region. The Iranian resistance and the MKO strongly condemn any such assistance.

### Nuclear Cooperation With China Denied

LD2210142991 Tehran IRNA in English 1319 GMT  
22 Oct 91

[Text] New Delhi, Oct. 22, IRNA—The Iranian Embassy here Tuesday denied rumours about Iran's atomic cooperation with China.

A statement released by the Iranian Embassy here today stressed that Iran advocates nuclear disarmament at the international level. It said, however, that the United States insists on the nuclear disarmament of South Asia solely because of its own selfish interests. The Madras-based English daily HINDU said in a report Monday that Iran is building a nuclear reactor with the cooperation of China.

### Mohajerani Demands Nuclear Capacity for Muslims

LD2310105391 Tehran IRNA in English 0842 GMT  
23 Oct 91

[Text] Tehran, Oct. 23, IRNA—Deputy President 'Atalollah Mohajerani said that if the Zionist regime should be allowed to remain as a nuclear power all Muslim countries will be entitled to the same privileges.

The decision on whether this or that nation should have nuclear power, he made it clear, does not rest with the United Nations or with any of its subsidiary agencies.

In an interview which appeared in the Persian daily ABRAR today, Mohajerani dwelt on the dangers to global peace if Israel is allowed to remain nuclear, and insisted "because the enemy has nuclear facilities the Muslim states, too, should be equipped with same capacity. We witnessed the destruction of Iraq's nuclear devices... He also warned of the tacit understanding between India and the illegal Zionist entity against the nuclear facilities of Muslim states, especially Pakistan.

"India and Israel have established contacts for destroying Pakistan's atomic centers. Sometime ago they wanted to use a Sri Lankan air base to destroy the nuclear centers in Pakistan. This implies that Israel has already felt the threats, and that it wants to have the upper hand in its dealing with the Muslim states," he disclosed.

Mohajerani called the nuclear device one form of maintaining a superiority, and said: "Therefore Muslims should strive to go ahead, which I hope they will. I am not talking only about one Muslim country, but rather the entirety of the Muslim states. Israel should be totally deprived of its nuclear capacity. I mean what has been done to Iraq in respect of its nuclear capacity should be done exactly to Israel. In other words the atomic capacity of Muslims and Israel should be at par. If Israel should be allowed to have nuclear power then, Muslim states, too, should be allowed to have same. That is not the business of the United Nations or of the Security Council

or of the investigating committee to decide... You know the you-are-welcome language is no language with which to address an enemy."

On the international conference on the rights of Palestinians which ended work in Tehran last night, the deputy president said the arrogant powers were scheming to present Palestine as a "long-since finished issue. We are witnessing circumstances at which they are trying to justify the occupation of Palestine."

The Americans are trying to omit even any mention of Palestine, he noted and recalled that sometime ago in Geneva the then Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh had told PLO's Yaser 'Arafat that the issue of Jerusalem was already finished, and he went on to repeat the same statement in his meeting with American Secretary of State James Baker in Cairo.

"As I see it the Americans, the Israelites and a group of Arabs calling themselves the pragmatists mean to suggest that there is no way for solving the issue of Palestine other than by recognizing the illegal state of Israel," regretted the Iranian official.

"The Tehran conference offers all Palestinians as well as all Muslim peoples who share the same view to get together. But in the long run the Muslims should be able to offer a counterbalance against Israel in default of which they will be unable to do as they should do.

"We must be hopeful that in the long run Palestine will be free, perhaps (God forbid) it may take another 100 years. The important thing for us is to find the devices for securing the liberation of Palestine. The tools and the devices are as important as the path to be taken," said Mohajerani.

The 4-day conference which brought government officials, parties and revolutionary figures from 60 countries including Palestinian leaders opposed to the sell-out of their rights as planned by the U.S. in Madrid, Spain, next week, ended on a note of success last night.

Among other issues, it debated the setting up of a fund to finance the intifadah in Palestine and the formation of an united Islamic army to liberate the first qiblah of Islam. The 28 point declaration ruled out any compromise with the Zionist enemy.

On the hostile propaganda of the West against the Tehran gathering Mohajerani said: "The propaganda of the westerners against the Palestine conference is worth pondering on. The CNN (Cable News Network of America) report for example, which I happened to see today shows only a part of the conference hall at which several seats are empty because at that moment most of the delegates sitting in that particular row were outside in the lobby. Immediately after, CNN has filmed queues of people in Tehran occasionally showing few exhausted faces to suggest that the public is fed up."

While at the same, he said the conference was well attended by parliamentary delegations, including four of

five of the leading officials of the parliaments in Algeria, Libya, and others. Even the chairman of the Palestine National Conference was in Tehran for this conference, in addition to 100 journalists and ministers from some countries.

"The Western Media brings up the topic of human rights in Iran in the hope that it will outshine the conference. It is unfortunate that even our own news networks are in the hands of such news agencies, which means we have to turn to those same news agencies when we want news about events elsewhere in the world," concluded the deputy president.

## IRAQ

### PRC Denial of Role in Nuclear Program Reported

JN0810122291 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1110 GMT  
8 Oct 91

[Text] Baghdad, 8 Oct (INA)—China yesterday described as baseless the information announced by David Kay's committee, which says that it participated in the Iraqi nuclear program.

David Kay's committee alleged that China provided sensitive equipment to Iraq for uranium enrichment and for manufacturing detonators for nuclear bombs.

A spokesman for the Ministry of Culture and Information commented on this report saying: This is more evidence that the objective of David Kay's committee is political blackmail in the service of the U.S. Administration and not the implementation of Security Council resolutions, since it is known that China faces strong pressure from the United States to give in to U.S. hegemony.

## ISRAEL

### Ne'eman on Nuclear Projects With USSR

TA1110074091 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew  
0600 GMT 11 Oct 91

[Report by economic correspondent Gil Tamari]

[Excerpt] The Russians are coming. Yuriy Korsun, acting USSR minister of energy and electrification [name, title as heard], will build a factory to manufacture prefabricated houses in Israel. Korsun, currently in Israel, has hundreds of professional teams that have built nuclear plants and power stations in the Soviet Union. These people are currently out of work and will be sent to Israel. [passage omitted]

### Arens Warns Knesset of 'Nuclear Weapons Era'

TA2310203991 Tel Aviv YEDI'OT AHARONOT  
in Hebrew 23 Oct 91 p 5

[Report from the Knesset by Hayim Shibi]

[Excerpt] "The Middle East is marching toward a nuclear weapons era. This is the reality we will have to

live in and prepare for; parallel with this, we will also have to take political action." These remarks were made yesterday by Defense Minister Moshe Arens at the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

"It seems to me that the U.S. Administration is determined and firm in its actions in Iraq, but let me remind you that there is also danger that the technology developed in Iraq might reach other countries, such as Libya, as well," the minister added.

Arens also talked about sentencing killer terrorists to death, even those who do not use live ammunition but only cold steel weapons: "These are people who behave not like human beings but like beasts. I will do everything I can so that the amendment to the law on this issue is passed and the option to hand down death sentences is made available." [passage omitted]

## LIBYA

### Alleged Technology Purchase From India Denied

LD1010132291 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1200 GMT  
10 Oct 91

[Commentary by JANA's international affairs editor]

[Text] Tripoli, 10 Oct (JANA)—Abid Hussain, Indian ambassador to the United States, stated that more than 10 years ago Libya tried to purchase nuclear technology from India, but his country refused. This was relayed by Voice of America radio. JANA's international affairs editor comments on that by saying:

First, the Great Jamahiriya has repeated again and again that it is against the manufacture and use of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction. The Great Jamahiriya has confirmed this in all of its legal documents, particularly in the Great Human Rights Green Document.

Second, the statements of the Indian ambassador are nothing more than irresponsible insinuations aimed at damaging the strong and fruitful relations between India and the Great Jamahiriya. If we take into consideration the extremely healthy status of the Libyan Arab-Indian relations and the friendship of the two countries, then this statement cannot be anything more than suspicious words, which could have been inspired by non-Indian quarters.

We again stress our intention to strengthen the historic cooperation and friendship relations which were, and still are, a model for the relations which serve peaceful coexistence and cooperation between the peoples and which are removed from deceit and imposing hegemony.

## PAKISTAN

### Nuclear Program Perceived for Atomic Bomb' Use

92WP0049A Peshawar THE FRONTIER POST  
in English 21 Sep 91 p 10

[Article by Dr. Anis Alam: "Pakistan's Atomic Bomb"]

[Text] All Pakistani governments from late General Zia's to Ms Bhutto's and now IJI Nawaz Sharif's have maintained the official stance that Pakistan's nuclear energy programme is for peaceful purposes. It is basically a programme to acquire expertise to have a self-reliant nuclear energy programme to meet the ever-increasing demand for electricity.

On the other hand there have been innumerable articles in the foreign press about Pakistan's clandestine programme to acquire capability for making an atomic bomb. Matters have been further complicated due to almost continuous boasts by A.Q. Khan, the head of the research laboratory at Kahuta, that almost conveys the impression that Pakistan has already been able to make an atomic bomb.

His now famous interview with the Indian journalist Kuldip Nayyar in early 1987 clearly stated that Pakistan already has an atomic bomb. Subsequently, many more articles have appeared in Pakistani press about the Pakistani atomic bomb. In 1989 a book was also published which eulogised Dr Abdul Qadeer Khan's achievements in this regard.

There is a very influential and vocal pro-atomic bomb lobby in Pakistan. Moreover, when one listens to talk among fairly well-informed people, an impression is formed that Pakistan's atomic energy programme is nothing but an atomic weapons programme. Most of the political parties have turned the atomic energy programme into a sacred cow. PPP claims the credit for starting the atomic bomb project, Zia's followers and IJI government claim to make the atomic bomb a reality. What is the reality? Lacking any positive affirmative statement but only the hostile reaction of the US government and her allies it seems that Pakistan does possess the capability to make an atomic bomb.

It is essential to understand that Pakistan atomic energy programme is basically a programme to acquire capability to make atomic bombs. This programme should therefore be considered as part of the procurement programme of Pakistan's armed forces to acquire effective and lethal weaponry. Atomic bomb for Pakistan's defence establishment is an extremely effective weapon like any other weapon, just more lethal, more effective and far more destructive. If this were not so, attempts should have been made to develop the science and technology required to develop nuclear capability. The sorry state of Pakistani science, especially related sciences of nuclear physics, solid state physics, microelectronics, metallurgical sciences and various engineering disciplines, has been repeatedly pointed out even

in official Pakistani publications. Since the mid-seventies, there has been no significant programme to train manpower in above-mentioned disciplines. In fact the development has been in reverse direction. The standard of science education and research has deteriorated to a level so as to alarm all of Pakistan's well-wishers. Without the trained manpower, scientists, engineers, technicians in adequate number backed by requisite infrastructure Pakistan's quest to develop nuclear capability will just be an idle dream. Pakistan may make one or several crude atomic bombs but she will not have a viable nuclear power programme.

Atomic bomb is being taken by the establishment as an effective deterrent. It is claimed that it is because of Pakistan's atomic bomb that India does not dare to attack Pakistan. Further, it is pointed out by the proponents of Pakistan's atomic bomb that since India already exploded an atomic device as early as 1974, Pakistan must also demonstrate its capability to have one so as to deter India from launching an attack on Pakistan. Reference is made to NATO deployment of nuclear weapons in Western Europe. The argument is as follows: Since Warsaw Pact forces had overwhelming superiority in conventional weapons and numerical superiority in armed soldiers, the only way to combat this superiority is through the deployment of atomic weapons.

The argument by proponents of atomic bomb in Pakistan goes along similar lines: Since Pakistan cannot hope to overcome Indian numerical superiority it must be combated with Pakistan's atomic bomb. In the following, we will examine the fallacy of this thinking and its disastrous consequences for Pakistani economy.

Pakistan's nuclear programme, despite consuming the lion's share of all allocation for scientific research for the last decade and a half, is yet to add one single kilowatt of electricity to national grid since early seventies. No country is willing to sell us a nuclear power plant for the generation of electricity, although the manufacturers of nuclear power plants in the US and Europe are desperate to export their plants because of almost no demand in their own countries. It would therefore be wise to reconsider the current nuclear programme.

Let us take the next crucial point; that Pakistan's atomic bomb is a deterrent. What constitutes a deterrent? If the experience of the superpowers is any guide, no specific number of atomic weapons is considered an effective enough deterrent. The US developed the first atomic bomb, USSR followed suit a few years later. Then US developed a far more destructive hydrogen bomb; USSR followed very quickly with its own.

A nuclear arms race ensued till the late eighties when the two possessed between themselves an arsenal of fifty thousand (50,000) atomic bombs.

These bombs possess an explosive force equivalent to twelve lakh (1,200,000) bombs of the type which destroyed Hiroshima.

The nuclear arsenal of the two superpowers represented 18 billion tonnes of TNT for every man, woman and child on earth. Almost three and a half tonnes of TNT for every inhabitant of earth. The above figures are enough to demonstrate the absurdity of the doctrine of deterrence through an atomic bomb.

In addition, the nuclear arms race between a richer (US) and comparatively poorer (USSR) led to the ruin of economy and society. Forced to spend a disproportionate percentage of national wealth on defence, the government neglected the productive sector leading to the economic chaos of the last five years. Despite all its nuclear arsenal, USSR has now to beg her adversaries for help to feed its citizens in the coming winter.

I hope Pakistani planners evolve different policies so that we do not have to face similar indignity in future. Already Pakistan is spending almost seven per cent of its total national wealth on defence. The norm for most developing countries is half of that.

Now that the superpowers themselves have given up on atomic weapons through all sorts of treaties to limit nuclear and other weapons Pakistan should not embark upon such a course.

Another point to be kept in mind by all is that atomic weapons are not like other conventional weapons. They are different. They not only kill; they are destroyers of all life and destruction is not limited to the present but affects the coming generations as well. Do we have the moral right to decide for our coming generations? All thinking persons should halt to ponder.

### Renowned Scientist Declares Nuclear Capability

WA2510133491 Karachi DAWN in English 22 Oct 91 p 1

[Text] Pakistan's renowned nuclear scientist, Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan, has said whether anyone believes it or not but it is a fact that Pakistan has become a nuclear power and is at present concentrating on manufacturing sophisticated arms to fulfill its requirements.

Dr. Qadir's announcement sent a wave of jubilation among the 200 top businessmen and industrialists of the country gathered at dinner meeting of the Federation of Pakistan Chambers of Commerce and Industry [FPCCI] on Monday.

However, Dr. Qadir made it clear that the nuclear breakthrough posed threat anyone [as published] would only put the country on the road to progress and prosperity, he added.

Just 10 years after the setting up of Pakistan's first nuclear enrichment plant at Kahuta in 1981, Pakistan was now one of the few countries of the world which possessed nuclear technology and knowhow, he pointed out.

Dr. Qadir, who attended the FPCCI dinner meeting mainly to arrange funds and donations from the business community for the RS 1.25 billion Ghulam Ishaq Khan Research Institute at Topi, near Tarbela in NWFP [North-West Frontier Province], said Pakistan's foreign aid had already been stopped and we are being pressured from all the anti-Pakistani lobbies to toe their line. "Indeed I am now one of the most wanted scientists in the world", he remarked.

After achieving the nuclear breakthrough, Dr. Qadir said, he personally approached President Ghulam Ishaq Khan to allow the scientists and engineers of Kahuta to manufacture arms and missiles for defence. "We fulfill our promise and presently the Pakistani engineers and scientists are manufacturing 350 million dollars worth of missiles and mines in the country", he said.

Dr Qadir disclosed that Pakistan had recently exported 500 laser range finders at 7500 dollars a piece to Saudi Arabia. "Our laser range finder was put to test along with the finders of US and Europe and I am proud to say that our finders left the others far behind", remarked.

Keeping in view the good quality and standard of Pakistan's laser finders, the Saudis were intending to order 1000 more, he said.

About the Ghulam Ishaq Research Institute, he said the total case [as published] of the institute, which would be one of the most advanced institutes of modern technology, would be about Rs 1.25 billion.

Dr. Qadir said Rs 500 million had been given by Agha Hasan Abedi of BCCI and said "now it was up to us to arrange the balance amount."

He said presently about 6,000 engineers and scientists were working at Kahuta and due to declining education standard "we are [as published] a sufficient numbers of facing great difficulty in procuring the services of engineers and scientists possessing the required skill and competence.

"The new institute which was a brainchild of the President and me will go a long way in producing the world's finest and top engineers and scientists," he remarked.

He pointed out that "we spend millions of rupees on musical and other social activities, but have turned a blind eye to education which determines the destiny of every nation."

Dr. Abdul Qadir Khan said a large number of Pakistani engineers and scientists were working abroad and their services could be utilised by the new institute for producing new engineers and scientists.



**Exodus of Soviet Nuclear Scientists Assessed***PM1610080691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 91 p 4*

[Report by correspondent A. Lyutyy: "Brain Drain.... Nuclear Scientists From the USSR—'For Hire' to Dictators?"]

[Text] London—There is growing concern in the West that certain Third World countries, in the quest for nuclear potential, are trying increasingly actively to get hold of out-of-work Soviet scientists.

This concern can be heard increasingly frequently both from government officials in Western states, and from well-known experts in nongovernmental organizations. Only the other day, for instance, Dr. Francois Heisbourg, director of the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, warned that the chaotic and unsystematic curtailment of Soviet research in the military sphere could lead to the emergence of a body of scientists for hire whom dictators seeking nuclear might could tempt with good pay and working conditions.

THE SUNDAY TIMES newspaper reported the following in this connection last Sunday: "U.S. and Israeli intelligence agencies believe that Syria and North Korea are trying to get Soviet scientists and weapons experts to help them accelerate armament programs and develop nuclear weapons. They have not discounted the possibility that Iraq and Libya, which relied in the past on official Soviet help, will offer large cash inducements to scientists."

In the view of the Israeli intelligence service Mossad, Syria is already recruiting Soviet specialists, some of whom have experience in creating nuclear weapons.

To be fair, it must be said that the West has sounded the alarm over the "brain drain" from the USSR only now that our experts have become the object of attention for countries with dictatorial and totalitarian regimes. When Soviet scientists supplemented the scientific potential of Israel and the United States themselves, everything was fine. And they are still doing so. Many of the 50,000 Soviet citizens who have arrived or will arrive in the United States this year for permanent residence are scientists. They are the people for whom the U.S. immigration authorities give the "green light" first of all.

Some former Soviet citizens are now working on various NASA projects. According to THE SUNDAY TIMES, more than 3,000 families of scientists from the USSR are living in the so-called Silicon Valley in California, in the zone of high-tech laboratories and production units. And every month some 35 new families arrive in the region. Most are from St. Petersburg, with the remainder from Moscow.

The deteriorating economic situation in the USSR coupled with cuts in budget appropriations for science programs, Western experts believe, makes it impossible to stop the exodus of Soviet experts. Science leaders in

the USSR are themselves pessimistic. A. Galiyev, director of the Space Research Institute in Moscow, is concerned: "There is a big danger of our leading scientists leaving for more comfortable working and living conditions abroad." Galiyev says that 500 of his best scientists are already working abroad on temporary contracts.

Under the conditions of declining orders for scientific research, some Soviet scientists see one solution in obtaining Western orders which will be carried out by Soviet research institutes. This possibility, THE SUNDAY TIMES writes, is not ruled out, for instance, by N. Ponomarev-Stepnoy, director of the Kurchatov Institute. "We have to keep the brains in this country," he says, "otherwise it will lead to destabilization in the world."

**Reaction to German Plan To Deploy Nuclear Arms***LD1610053691 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 15 Oct 91*

[By military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow October 15 TASS—Bundeswehr General-Inspector Klaus Naumann has announced FRG's readiness to deploy on German territory "a small number of nuclear weapons, which could be carried also by Bundeswehr aircraft".

Interviewed by the magazine "DER SPIEGEL", Naumann expressed the view that since the Soviet Union was living through a period of changes, the outcome of which is far from clear so far, several new nuclear powers may appear on its former territory instead of one. Hence, in his opinion, Germany needs protection against any nuclear blackmail, which could be guaranteed only by arming the German air force with nuclear weapons.

In light of this, it is worth recalling that the FRG is a signatory of the nuclear weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty, under which the non-nuclear states have pledged not to accept nuclear weapons from anybody and not to assume control over them, not to produce or to obtain them by any other means. Naumann's initiative is nothing but an attempt to give Germany a chance to flagrantly violate the spirit and letter of this important international document on the ephemeral grounds that it may be breached by some republics of the former USSR.

Eager for sensations, the mass media, including Soviet means of mass information, have recently published unvarnished reports claiming that "some republics are establishing their control over Soviet nuclear weapons" and that they may resort to them without any sanctions from the centre. They also claim that this could now be done even by ordinary missile division commanders. Public statements by political leaders, such as Naumann's, just as recent irresponsible publications about nuclear weapons, tend to jeopardise the Non-Proliferation Treaty's regime.

In the meantime, this treaty's erosion and eventual collapse may sharply destabilise the world military-political situation. The "nuclear club's" expansion by even as little as two or three members may drastically weaken the barriers keeping in check the spread of nuclear arms.

#### **France To Help Modernize Nuclear Stations**

*PM0810112591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
4 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report from the "IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA" column]

[Text] Soviet nuclear power generation may be modernized with the help of French technology.

For the first time ever, the French "Framatome" company, the world leader in nuclear power station construction, has signed a major contract for the delivery of equipment for Soviet nuclear stations. Specialists are convinced, our correspondent was told at the NFM firm, a Framatome subsidiary, that once their units are installed, our stations using VVER-1000 reactors will be more modern and secure.

#### **China Will Accede to Nuclear Treaty**

##### **Upon Completion of Legal Procedures**

*OW3110091691 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0909 GMT 31 Oct 91*

[Text] Beijing, October 31 (XINHUA)—A Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today that China will accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) upon completion of the legal procedures.

In reply to a question at the weekly news conference, he said that the 22nd meeting of the Seventh Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPC), which ended Wednesday, deliberated the State Council's proposal for China's accession to the NPT.

The deliberations will continue, he added.

##### **Nuclear Export Policy Detailed**

*OW3110084691 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0838 GMT 31 Oct 91*

[Text] Beijing, October 31 (XINHUA)—A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today that China has cooperated with many countries, including Iran, in the field of peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Responding to a question at the weekly news conference, the spokesman described as "groundless" the report that China provided technology to Iran for the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

He stated that China strictly observes three principles concerning its nuclear export: first, its export is only for peaceful purposes; second, China accepts the safeguard

and supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency; third, the recipient country must not transfer the nuclear technology to any third country without China's prior permission.

#### **Envoy to PRC: Arms To Remain in Far East**

*OW1510152191 Tokyo KYODO in English 1454 GMT  
15 Oct 91*

[Text] Beijing, Oct. 15 KYODO—Soviet Ambassador to China Nikolay Solovyev indicated Tuesday [15 October] that Soviet forces are likely to delay withdrawing surface tactical nuclear arms deployed in the Soviet Far East despite President Mikhail Gorbachev's sweeping nuclear arms cut proposal disclosed earlier this month.

Solovyev said Tuesday in an interview with KYODO News Service that the surface tactical nuclear arms will be removed from the European region first due to jurisdictional difficulties.

He said there is some uncertainty over control because nuclear arms deployed in the European region are distributed over several republics of the Soviet Union. He attributed the delay in their removal from the Far East to the domestic situation in the Soviet Union.

Solovyev said neither China or Japan pose a threat to the Soviet Union. However, some Western observers have said the Soviets are considering maintaining a deterrent against China.

Gorbachev did not disclose detailed procedures for removal of the surface tactical nuclear arms.

#### **Pugwash Council Urges End to Nuclear Weapons**

*LD0810140891 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT  
8 Oct 91*

[Text] Moscow October 8 TASS—The time has come to begin the elimination of all tactical nuclear weapons, says the Pugwash Council's message to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and the leaders of the other nuclear powers.

The council met in Beijing on September 17-22 on the occasion of the 41st Pugwash Conference on science and world problems.

The message that was made available to TASS on Tuesday emphasises that the danger connected with the stockpiles of tactical nuclear weapons and their stationing "calls for immediate action".

A memorandum attached to the message sets out a plan for specific measures that could be taken to eliminate nuclear systems that do not fall under the provisions of the strategic arms reduction treaty.

Scientists suggest that countries possessing tactical nuclear arms announce types, models, the number and locations of weapons subject to destruction within one month of making a pledge to eliminate them.

Participants in the Pugwash Council meeting believe that countries should prepare special storages to keep tactical nuclear weapons and ensure the guarding of the weapons under international supervision against a possible attack or stealing.

All tactical nuclear weapons should be stowed in supervised storages, the memorandum states.

At the weapons elimination stage that will continue for several years, it is planned to scrap delivery vehicles and electronic equipment, to burn explosives and re-process fissionable substances under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency into fuel for civilian nuclear reactors.

The memorandum admits the right of countries to suspend unilateral actions in declaring and storing tactical nuclear weapons if the other main possessor of nuclear weapons does not take similar measures within a designated time-frame.

The members of the Pugwash Council believe that such measures will make it possible not only to place nuclear weapons under a reliable control, ruling out the possibility of an unsanctioned use of the weapons, but also to begin to eliminate nuclear systems in earnest.

#### PRC Reaction to Reduction Proposals Cited

*PM0910114291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5*

[Correspondent Yu. Savenkov report: "China Welcomes It, But...."]

[Text] Beijing—The Chinese newspapers are reporting M.S. Gorbachev's initiative on nuclear arms reduction with restraint, as if they are keeping their distance. What would Beijing itself say? There was a long silence. After two days had elapsed, foreign correspondents started impatiently calling the Foreign Ministry (I was among them). A polite voice replied: Wait for the response.

Soon, the XINHUA agency teletype carried a statement from an unidentified Foreign Ministry staffer repeating word for word the Chinese reaction to G. Bush's initiative. China welcomes the Gorbachev plan, but continues to believe that the United States and the USSR, which have huge nuclear arsenals, bear special responsibility in the nuclear disarmament sphere.

In Beijing diplomatic circles, this response to Bush was dubbed a "polite gesture." One diplomat told me: "Beijing had an opportunity to take a real step in the same direction, but preferred to remain within its traditional framework." The logic of Beijing's reasoning apparently goes like this: Take no notice of us; we are a developing country, we account for too small a share; the supreme responsibility rests with the United States and the USSR, so let them make the cuts; we can only support this. Why was the text of the response to the two presidents identical? Diplomats in Beijing believe that, first, Beijing

thereby emphasizes its equidistance from the two countries, and, second, it shows once again that it is not prepared to participate in the nuclear disarmament process.

Western experts believe that China manufactures shorter-, intermediate-, and longer-range missiles. They are capable of carrying nuclear warheads, but, on announcing Beijing's decision in principle to adhere to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (China was the last of the great powers), a Foreign Ministry spokesman again stressed that in China the quantity of nuclear weapons is small and is exclusively for self-defense purposes.

In any case, many observers are concerned: Despite the reductions in weapons of mass destruction announced by the two presidents, there are still plenty of them in the arsenals of many countries, and they could in future spread to other countries too. Not only the United States and the USSR should participate in the disarmament process.

#### DPRK Ambassador on Nuclear Guarantees

*LD1810205291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1914 GMT 15 Oct 91*

[By diplomatic correspondent Vladimir Suprun]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Oct (TASS)—"We are prepared to conclude an agreement on nuclear guarantees, on condition that the United States withdraws its nuclear arms from the territory of South Korea," Son Song-pil, the DPRK ambassador to the Soviet Union, has declared. He was commenting at a news conference held today for Soviet journalists on U.S. President George Bush's initiative to reduce U.S. nuclear arms.

According to the ambassador, the United States should begin such a withdrawal from the territory of South Korea, since "that is the very place where the greatest danger of a nuclear conflict exists." That step, the ambassador commented, should become the first on the road to the complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea.

#### Kravchuk Cited on Nuclear Arms

*PM2310214391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 91 First Edition p 1*

[Captain Second Rank V. Pasyakin "Direct Line" report: "L. Kravchuk in the Black Sea Fleet"]

[Excerpt] Sevastopol—Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman L. Kravchuk arrived at the main base of the Black Sea Fleet 22 October. After a meeting with the labor collective of the "Morskoy Zavod Imeni S. Ordzhonikidze" production association, the Ukrainian presidential candidate addressed naval servicemen.

L. Kravchuk expressed himself in particular in favor of the stability of existing borders between sovereign states

and primarily states such as Russia and the Ukraine. He emphasized that the Crimean ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] must remain within the Ukraine since 90 percent of the Crimea's economic ties are with Ukrainian enterprises. The Ukrainian presidential candidate noted in particular the republic's need to have its own armed forces numbering some 450,000 men. In his opinion the control of the nuclear strategic forces should be in single hands, and the Ukraine does not aspire to the control of these forces. [passage omitted]

#### Official Cited on Nuclear Weapons Issues

LD2310202591 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1910 GMT 23 Oct 91

[By UKRINFORM correspondents Aleksandr Litvinov and Mikhail Melnik for TASS]

[Text] Kiev, 23 October (TASS)—The Ukraine has no intention of retaining nuclear weapons that are deployed on its territory and it has no plans for the creation of its own strategic troops. This was revealed today in an interview given to UKRINFORM correspondents by Pavel Mysnik, chairman of the subcommission of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet permanent commission on issues of defense and state security.

He stressed that the Ukraine will adhere to those interstate treaties which have been concluded by the former USSR including those on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons.

Issues, Pavel Mysnik said, connected with the Ukraine complying with the non-nuclear principles that it has proclaimed are now being worked out, including the abolition of the nuclear weapons which are deployed on its territory. The majority of these, it is known, will be destroyed in accordance with a treaty concluded between the USSR and the United States. As far as those weapons which are not covered by this treaty are concerned, the republican Supreme Soviet and its government are seeking ways to destroy them, the chairman of the parliamentary subcommission added.

#### Ukraine Seeks To Retain Nuclear Arms

LD2010144791 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT  
20 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vadim Chistov]

[Excerpt] Brasilia October 20 TASS—[passage omitted] The Ukrainian premier also declared categorically against the removal of nuclear weapons from the republic's territory. His opinion is that, considering a threat of coups in the USSR, as a result of which control over nuclear arms may pass into the hands of irresponsible people, nuclear weapons should not be taken out of the Ukraine.

Having recalled that the Ukrainian parliament had decided to establish a nuclear-free zone on the republic's territory, Fokin remarked that "this is a matter of the future. Meanwhile it is essential to work out a common system of strategic security, which is one of the functions of the central government."

#### Landsbergis Fears Deployment of Nuclear Arms

LD0810174791 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT  
8 Oct 91

[By correspondent Dmitriy Voskoboinikov]

[Excerpt] Blackpool October 8 TASS—Troops must be withdrawn from Lithuania the soonest possible, as their presence there is dangerous to the people and is a continuing violation of international law, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis told an informal meeting within the framework of the annual conference of British Tories.

According to him, the Soviet Union wants to legalize the presence of its troops in the republic and intends to adjust the Soviet-American Intermediate Nuclear Force Treaty to apply to the changed situation in such a way as to make Lithuania a country on whose territory Soviet nuclear weapons will continue to be deployed.

"We shall not agree to this," Landsbergis said.

"American inspectors should check whether these rockets have been relocated to some other place on Soviet territory and then check to see whether these weapons are no longer on Lithuanian territory."

Landsbergis stressed that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania is also important because there remains a possibility of another, and perhaps more successful coup d'etat in the Soviet Union as a number of old structures have been preserved.

He told journalists that the Baltic Council intends to pressure for Soviet withdrawal from the capitals of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia before December 1, 1991. [passage omitted]

#### No Progress in Chemical Warfare Destruction

PM2310091991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
22 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[Text] On 1 June 1990 the presidents of the United States and the USSR signed the agreement on the total destruction of the two countries' chemical weapons. The commitments assumed by our state demand that we get such work under way before 31 December 1992. But to date there is not a single plant in the USSR for the destruction of combat toxins, and construction has not even been started... What are the reasons for this situation?

Colonel General S. Petrov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry's Chemical Troops, answers our correspondent's questions.

"In my view," Stanislav Veniaminovich said, "the main reason is that the agreement signed in Washington almost 18 months ago still does not have juridical force. It has not been ratified by the country's Supreme Soviet and has not even been submitted to it for ratification. Although we drew up a state program for the destruction of chemical weapons together with other ministries and departments on the president's instructions and submitted it to Supreme Soviet commissions and committees and then, after additional work, also to the former Cabinet of Ministers, there is neither the money nor a decision to implement it."

[Litovkin] What sums are needed to implement this program? And for what term is it designed?

[Petrov] With regard to money—just over 5.4 billion rubles [R] at 1991 prices. But as for the term....

There are several options for the destruction of chemical weapons. One of them is to construct terminals for the transfer of mustard gas, lewisite, and their compounds in the areas where they are stored, from large capacities to specially developed technological transport containers which meet all international safety norms.

It is proposed to construct these terminals (without them it is hard to count on the safe processing of lewisite) in Udmurtia, where the main stocks of the substances I have mentioned are held, and in Saratov Oblast. This will take four or five years and R200 million. This will also go on the construction of sociocultural and domestic projects and engineering networks and on the development of the infrastructure in these areas.

With other options—for example, when reequipping or reprofiling chemical enterprises in order to destroy toxins—it will take a year or two after the adoption of such a decision.

We already have everything ready—the state program weighs a total of 35 kg, planning and surveying examinations have been conducted, as has other research and development work, on which almost R100 million has been spent—but everything is still up in the air....

A state commission to choose and agree on the areas for such projects has not yet even been set up, there are no organizational staff structures that will implement the toxin destruction program.... In my view, it is inadmissible to endlessly protract the resolution of such problems.

[Litovkin] But the country has many other paramount problems today. The destruction of chemical weapons is far from being the chief among them.

[Petrov] Undoubtedly. But the failure of the agreement signed in Washington casts doubt on our country's

readiness to honor its pledges. And not only in respect of chemical weapons. Confidence is easily lost and cannot be restored for any money.

[Litovkin] How do things stand with our partners' destruction of their chemical weapons?

[Petrov] The Americans constructed the first enterprise for the destruction of toxins by the method of direct incineration on Johnson Island in the Pacific. And they have already begun this work, although they have reportedly experienced some problems with safety there.

They are now constructing several installations in the continental part of the country, next to the places where chemical weapons are stored, and will, I believe, fulfill their pledges with regard to their destruction by 1998, just as envisaged. The chief point is that they have adopted national legislation on this question. This enables them to marshal their forces efficiently and to work without fuss or haste, observing all precautions.

Incidentally, the United States pays very great attention to work with the public and the population of those areas where installations for the destruction of toxins are being constructed. It even has, within the structure of the Department of Defense chemical disarmament committee, a special subdepartment which explains to people the full safety of the technological operations in installations for the destruction of such weapons, and eminent scientists are recruited for this purpose, moreover, from scientific establishments in those places where installations for the destruction of toxins are being created.

[Litovkin] The United States has repeatedly offered us assistance in constructing installations for the destruction of toxins on the basis of its own technology.... Does it, perhaps, make sense to accept it? This will be less costly.

[Petrov] Unfortunately, not less costly. We have made a comprehensive analysis of these offers and concluded that it will not profit us to realize them. For both economic and technical reasons....

[Litovkin] One other financial question. Practically all stocks of chemical weapons are concentrated on Russian territory. It turns out that Russia alone must pay for their destruction.

[Petrov] In my view, it is unfair to put the question in this way. The stocks of combat toxins were created by the whole country on the basis of its scientific, industrial, and military potential. And the burden of the expenditure on destroying and utilizing them must, of course, be borne proportionally by all the sovereign republics.

[Litovkin] And the final point. The country is switching to new forms of economic management. Why do you not

take on independent, nongovernmental organizations as partners in the destruction and utilization of toxins?

[Petrov] We are ready to cooperate with them and are open to any offers, both financial and economic, technical.... The only point we must bear in mind is the juridical responsibility borne under international law by

state structures for the safety and control of toxins as weapons of mass destruction.

There is enough work for everyone. We are prepared to share it. Provided there is real assistance and real action aimed at fulfilling our obligations.

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

**NATO Expected To Scrap Short-Range N-Weapons***OW1409012891 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0101 GMT 14 Sep 91*

[Text] Brussels, September 13 (XINHUA)—NATO Secretary Manfred Woerner on Thursday confirmed that the NATO will make decision to eliminate all short-range nuclear weapons deployed in Europe, according to British newspaper "FINANCIAL TIMES" today.

Woerner said a formal decision was likely to be made at the NATO's Rome summit in November.

But he said the question remained whether NATO should scrap the weapons unilaterally or seek a formal agreement with Moscow on the lines of the 1987 INF treaty.

NATO leaders agreed last year to remove the allies' total stockpile of about 1,500 nuclear artillery shells if the Soviet Union agrees to do the same.

Plans for a drastic reduction in the number of U.S. warheads in Europe—estimated at about 3,700 including aircraft bombers—are expected to be agreed by allies' defence ministers next month.

U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney accepted last weekend that land-based nuclear weapons in Europe were now "practically unnecessary".

In the case of outright withdrawal, the question of verification would emerge. Both U.S. and Britain have argued that a treaty would be difficult to verify. They are also trying to preserve plans for a new generation of nuclear missiles carried by aircraft, as means of maintaining "sub-strategic" nuclear capability in Europe.

## BELGIUM

**Government Splits on Arms Sales to Saudi Arabia****Cabinet Reshuffle***LD2909170991 Brussels La Une Network in French  
1600 GMT 20 Sep 91*

[Excerpt] Three and a half months before the legislative elections, the government coalition has this weekend lost a partner: the Flemish nationalists from the Volksunie were unable to reach agreement with their partners on further arms sales to Saudi Arabia. After several weeks of tension, the Flemish party asked Hugo Schiltz, its representative at the inner Cabinet meeting, to announce that it was distancing itself from both the Socialists and the Christians. This refusal, which was registered yesterday evening, was confirmed this morning during a brief Cabinet meeting: after a meeting lasting 45 minutes, Wilfried Martens announced to the press that he was going to propose to the King that the whole of his team

resign, but the resignation of the two sole representatives of the Volksunie, Hugo Schiltz and Andre Geens.

An hour later their successors were designated, two secretaries of state who have been elevated to the rank of minister—Wivana Demeester to finance and Erik Derycke to development cooperation.

Following this Wilfried Martens convened his new government for a first Cabinet meeting. As in the past few days we shall go over to Martine Van Brouzegem at the Rue de la Loi, Martine:

[Brouzegem] Yes, the new government is on the road: the first Cabinet meeting tried to wipe out the difficulties of recent weeks: in fact, as early as this afternoon, the king signed the royal decrees creating the regional ministerial committees within the national government and these will have the competence to deal with export licences. These ministerial committees will observe the national norms, in other words the law on the export of and trade in arms will be valid for all. [passage omitted]

**Impact on Arms Exports***AU2909153591 Paris AFP in English 1504 GMT  
29 Sep 91*

[Excerpt] Brussels, Sept 29 (AFP)—King Baudouin on Sunday approved a cabinet reshuffle by Prime Minister Wilfried Martens to overcome a crisis over arms exports to Saudi Arabia.

The reshuffle sees the ousting of the two ministers from the pacifist Flemish party Volksunie, which refused to go along with a proposal that Belgian arms manufacturers be allowed to sell weapons to Saudi Arabia.

They were Deputy Prime Minister Hugo Schiltz, who was responsible for the budget, and Cooperation and Development Minister Andre Geens. [passage omitted]

## FRANCE

**Joxe Seeks Assurances on Soviet Nuclear Security***LD1909163591 Paris Antenne-2 Television Network  
in French 1800 GMT 17 Sep 91*

[Report by correspondent Laurent Boussie]

[Excerpts] Western powers' anxiety about the future of the USSR's formidable nuclear arsenal does not disappear behind the official toasts and dinners, the declarations of eternal friendship, and the assurances that the East and the West will no longer be enemies. Pierre Joxe, the first Western defense minister to come and seek assurances on this matter, studied the difficulties faced by the Soviet authorities. If, on the subject of strategic nuclear weapons—90 percent of which are stationed on Russian territory—the problem seems settled and the control by Union representatives effective, doubt and anxiety are increasing as far as the 15,000 tactical short-term missiles dotted all around the territory of the

former USSR. The Western powers' greatest fear, along with certain Russians, is to see the republics achieving independence without being denuclearized. [passage omitted] Strategic, tactical, risk of proliferation: the Soviets only replied partially to the guarantees demanded by Pierre Joxe on the future control and security of their nuclear weapons. [passage omitted]

### **Mitterrand Views Bush Arms Reduction Proposals**

#### **More Reduction Welcome**

*PM0110102091 Paris LE MONDE in French 1 Oct 91  
p 6*

[Unattributed report: "Mitterrand: 'A Little More Effort, Gentlemen'"]

[Excerpts] During his visit to Evry on Saturday, 28 September, Francois Mitterrand commented on the U.S. nuclear arms reductions announced by the U.S. President, stating in particular: "George Bush and I spoke on the telephone four times in the first five days of the week..., and I welcome the initiatives which the U.S. President has proposed to what was until recently the Soviet world. That is a remarkable effort...." [passage omitted]

"In the nuclear weapons sphere, the reductions so far bring the two most powerful countries down to several thousand nuclear warheads whereas we only have a few hundred. I feel like saying to them: More effort, gentlemen! And we will be happy to sit down at the table with you. I hope we will shortly sit down at the table to discuss nuclear security in the world."

#### **Defense Minister Comments**

*PM0110104091 Paris LE MONDE in French 1 Oct 91  
p 6*

[Unattributed report: "We May Be at a Historic Turning Point"]

[Text] Defense Minister Pierre Joxe, who was the guest on the Luxembourg Radio-LE MONDE "Grand Jury" program on Sunday 29 September, said it was "understandable" that Mikhail Gorbachev's reaction to George Bush's disarmament proposals was "cautious," knowing that the START negotiations "at best envisaged a 25-30 percent reduction" and that the U.S. President is now suggesting "cutting strategic nuclear arms by half." "I would like to add," he said, "that there are different kinds of strategic nuclear weapons. In particular there are those which are on submarines. Mr. Bush does not mention them."

Mr. Joxe continued: "France, which has a very small number of missile-launching submarines, and which has a very small number of tactical nuclear weapons, approves of Mr. Bush's proposals which validate our recent analyses and proposals, but it is entitled to add: 'More effort!' The Soviets need to examine this more

closely.... Faced with a situation which seems to be improving after constantly worsening for decades, I say: Let us be patient! We may be at a historic turning point. The next few weeks will confirm that." For the defense minister, "the most dangerous proliferation, which is implicitly mentioned in Mr. Bush's statement, is ballistic proliferation."

Mr. Joxe explained that "as soon as disarmament by the main nuclear powers reaches a significant level, France will be able to join such discussions" but that "for the time being, France is not part of that game." Questioned on the criticisms made by General Jean Salvan, former commander of the Atlantic military defense region, the minister said that this officer "seems to be losing his head" and that "all those who read his article will realize that it was time he went."

### **Thailand To Buy Air Defense Missiles**

*PM0810101091 Paris LE MONDE in French  
6-7 Oct 91 p 20*

[Text] Thailand has just chosen the French Thomson-CSF group for the purchase of new generation Crotale air defense missiles and it is due to sign the contract, estimated to be worth around 5.5 billion francs, before the end of October. This deal relates to the supply of around 20 batteries of these missiles which can be mounted on armored vehicles (to provide air defense of battle corps movements) or installed in blockhouses (for the protection of sensitive ground areas from low-altitude raids).

The new generation Crotale weapon system, which reaches speeds three and a half times the speed of sound, can intercept planes, helicopters, or cruise missiles in a few seconds, at a distance of 10 km. It has already been purchased by France (for the Air Force and Navy), Finland, and Singapore. Discussions are well advanced with the Netherlands and South Korea.

### **Accord Reached on Nuclear Research Funding**

*92WP0015A Paris LE FIGARO (LE FIG-ECO  
supplement) in French 2 Oct 91 p 5*

[Article by Edouard Thevenon: "Research: Accord Between Atomic Energy Commission, EDF, and Framatome"—first paragraph is LE FIGARO introduction]

[Text] Contributions toward financing of research will henceforth be calculated on a contractual basis...

EDF, Framatome, and CEA [Atomic Energy Commission] have finally reached an agreement on financing of nuclear research. The framework agreement recently initialled by the three bodies is expected to be signed by the end of the month, a CEA spokesman confirmed.

The CEA-Cogema accord, the broad outlines of which have already been agreed, may also be concluded before the end of the year. Under the new contracts, EDF and



Framatome will increase their payments to CEA from 460 million French francs [Fr] in 1990 to nearly Fr600 million this year.

It has taken nearly two years of negotiations to straighten out relations between the nuclear power companies and CEA in the research domain. The clarification was sought by Philippe Rouvillois even before he was named top administrator of CEA; subsequently, at his request, the idea was adopted by the Council of Ministers in October 1989.

Until now, the financial involvement of EDF, Framatome and Cogema in CEA research projects had no coherent rationale. A minute part of their contributions corresponded to actual research contracts. Cogema paid a fee, calculated as a percentage of its sales, for uranium enrichment and fuel reprocessing technology. But the company was not informed of the work CEA was doing in its field of activity. EDF's contribution was set by the government, independently of any research programs. This financing was dubbed "the tithe."

A major survey of ongoing research programs was undertaken. It succeeded in identifying about 1,500 research subjects—and discovering that some 5 percent were redundant. Next, it was decided to establish new relations on a contractual basis, by adopting the following principle: Medium- and long-term projects would be supervised by CEA, with more than half the costs paid by government subsidies; short-term projects would be under the control of the companies, which would also pay for them.

#### Joint Committee

A joint scientific committee will be responsible for allocating the projects between these two families and arriving at a formula for cost-sharing. For example, the cost of testing a new type fuel will be divided equally between CEA, Framatome and EDF. But CEA will pay 90 percent of the cost of long-term research on "advanced" reprocessing, while Cogema pays only 10 percent.

On this basis, Framatome's contribution is expected to increase from Fr80 million in 1990 to Fr160 million this year, while EDF's share will grow from Fr380 to about Fr430 million. This augmentation will increase CEA's "external" revenues (Fr3.6 billion this year), while the inflation-adjusted value of government subsidies for civilian purposes (Fr6.2 billion in 1991) decreases from one year to the next.

#### Dumas: Uranium Main Problem in Iran Dispute

AU2210115491 Paris AFP in English 1047 GMT  
22 Oct 91

[Text] Paris, Oct 22 (AFP)—Iranian pressure on France to supply enriched uranium poses the main remaining problem to a long-running dispute between Paris and

Tehran but a solution is likely, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said here ahead of a visit by a top Iranian official on Wednesday.

"There is still a major point which is the right or not to have uranium. I think that we shall find a formula," Dumas told journalists the day before negotiations with Iranian Vice Foreign Minister Mahmud Va'ez.

A second outstanding question concerned fiscal matters.

The last round of negotiations was held in Iran in July between Vaezi and French Foreign Ministry Secretary General Francois Scheer. Informed sources said that they were held up by a last-minute Iranian demand to be permitted to remove enriched uranium from France. France saw this as a problem in an unstable region, particularly as Iran does not have a working nuclear power station capable of using such material.

The dispute concerns payment by France of outstanding capital and interest in connection with a loan of one billion dollars made by the Shah of Iran in 1974 for the construction of a uranium enrichment plant by the Eurodif company.

Under the terms of the agreement, Iran undertook to remove part of the uranium enriched in the plant.

The dispute concerns also compensation that Iran should pay to French companies for contracts broken as a consequence of the Islamic revolution against the Shah in 1979.

Saying that he believed that a solution was now close, Dumas expressed satisfaction that relations with Iran were developing politically and that trade was going well. France had risen from being Iran's 20th trading partner to fifth place.

## GERMANY

#### Concern About Lax EC Arms Export Controls

AU1310153891 Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG  
in German 12 Oct 91 p 6

[Report by "DEU": "EC Opens Door To Arms Exporters"]

[Text] Bonn—When the EC single market is set up on 1 January 1993, national arms export controls will virtually become ineffective without the EC having planned to replace them by relevant regulations. That was the conclusion drawn at a meeting held by SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] experts in Bonn on 11 October under the motto "Arms Export Controls—The European Dimension." Joerg Wenzel, deputy chief of cabinet of EC Commission Vice President Martin Bangemann, said that even though the EC Commission intends to submit proposals before the end of this year to harmonize arms export controls within the whole of the EC, he is not very optimistic about whether the EC

countries would accept these proposals: "A majority of the EC countries reject the harmonization of arms export controls as not feasible within a short period of time." In order for something to move, a decision of the EC summit meeting in Maastricht in December, including a "radical correction of course," would be necessary, said Wenzel.

The establishment of the EC single market means that as of 1992, all national border checks will be abolished. Thus an arms company could, in the future, transport its weapons to a subsidiary in Spain, for instance, where there is practically no restriction on arms exports, so that arms and military materiel can be sold there to third countries. In this way, the strict German rules would become ineffective.

Representatives of France and Great Britain were sharply criticized at the meeting. Both countries have been considered the main opponents to an EC arms export control system planned by Economics Minister Juergen Moellemann. "We are traveling across Europe like itinerant preachers, calling upon others to copy our regulations," said Joachim Jahnke, a high official in the Economics Ministry. He deplored that "arms exports in Great Britain are officially promoted by the Defense Ministry." Jahnke also doubts that agreement on this issue can be achieved at all with France and Britain. According to Jahnke, the largest companies in the Federal Republic depend on arms deals for no more than 9 percent of their production, whereas those in France and Great Britain depend on such deals for 40 percent of their production. Jahnke does not believe that these differences "in the governments' export policies can be brought to a common denominator."

#### **Talks Dispel Concern on Soviet Nuclear Weapons**

*LD0110005391 Berlin ADN in German 1930 GMT  
30 Sep 91*

[Excerpts] Eberswalde (ADN)—Concerns about Soviet nuclear weapons suspected to be in the new federal laender have been dispelled. Social Democratic Party leader Bjoern Engholm stated this in Eberswalde today after talks with the Soviet commander-in- chief of the Western Group of Forces in Germany, Colonel General Matvey Burlakov. Engholm does not see any reason for mistrusting Burlakov's assurance that the last stocks were withdrawn months ago. Burlakov issued an invitation to visit any Army installation at any time in order to dispel any remaining doubts. Engholm said that he would recommend that this be done. [passage omitted]

According to Engholm, the colonel general expressed confidence that there will be a unified commando structure for nuclear weapons in the future Soviet Union. There will not be decentralized availability in individual republics. Engholm stressed the necessity of "several new powers not suddenly emerging with nuclear weapons in Europe."

Burlakov renewed his willingness to cooperate with the Bundeswehr. German soldiers can come to the Western Group for training, which will also help to remove the concept of the enemy.

The minister-president of Schleswig-Holstein said that the subject of extremism vis-a-vis Soviet soldiers was also discussed. [passage omitted]

#### **Plan To Sell Warships to Taiwan Being Decided**

*AU2110130391 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German  
21 Oct 91 p 16*

[Text] The FRG Government is preparing an arms export deal worth 18 billion German marks [DM]. Taiwan, the island state that opposes Communist China, has ordered warships for this sum. The FRG Security Council is to decide on this order soon.

Promising prospects are opening up for the German ship-building industry, which is suffering both in the east and in the west. The eastern German shipyards in particular, from whom the Soviets do not want to buy the ships they ordered, are very interested in the deal. Otto Count Lambsdorff, chairman of the Free Democratic Party of Germany [FDP], is urging the delivery, pointing out that Taiwan is well on the way toward democracy. The chancellor has now asked the Foreign Ministry for an assessment of the political situation on the island.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher's Foreign Ministry and Juergen Moellemann's Economics Ministry are in a quandary: The order involving billions of marks would be very valuable for the upswing in the east, but the FDP guidelines for strict arms export controls, which are supposed to be adopted at the party congress in Suhl at the beginning of November, would be ignored by the Taiwan deal. In addition, the Foreign Ministry officials fear that Beijing would consider the delivery of warships to Taiwan as an affront.

Moellemann, who has advocated strict arms export laws, would put his credibility at stake if he agreed to the project. In addition, his visit to China, which is being prepared for November, might be put under strain. Lorenz Schomerus, the department head responsible for foreign trade policy, is worried that his trip to Taiwan, which has long been planned for a different purpose, is now being considered as a preparation of the arms deal.

If Bonn supplies arms to other countries, it gets into conflict with its own armament principles. "We will end up in a political muddle," a cabinet member warns against the billion-mark deal. "This is not compatible with the FRG Government's arms export policy."

**Stoltenberg on Minimum Stock of Nuclear Weapons****Reduce Airborne Systems***LD1510083391 Hamburg DPA in German 2330 GMT 14 Oct 91*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg has welcomed the fact that the volume of nuclear weapons in the sphere of airborne systems in Europe is also to be considerably reduced.

Speaking to the press in Bonn on Monday evening, Stoltenberg pointed out that, according to American newspaper reports, at the forthcoming session of the Nuclear Planning Group in Taormina in Sicily, there is to be a decision to reduce to "well below 1,000" the 1,700 or so airborne nuclear bombs, some of them stationed in Germany and Great Britain. Nevertheless, NATO should "not take the path towards a complete denuclearization of Europe."

In Stoltenberg's view, a minimum stock of nuclear bombs is indispensable for the North Atlantic Alliance. This would counteract a nuclear threat of whatever kind. The proposals of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on a complete removal of airborne nuclear systems is not in line with the security interests of Western Europe. Stoltenberg praised the fact that U.S. President George Bush and Gorbachev intend to renounce all land and sea-based tactical nuclear weapons. This is in line with a stance that the FRG Government has taken for a long time.

Stoltenberg was in favor of increased security policy relations with the young democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, as well as the Soviet Union. A territorial extension of the area of the NATO treaty was not yet on the agenda, the minister stressed. The cooperation of forces in bilateral and multilateral forms should help build confidence. Stoltenberg ruled out the acceptance of the USSR into NATO for the next few years.

**Reduce Nuclear Bombs***AU1610100891 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 16 Oct 91 p 8*

[Ruediger Moniac report: "NATO Wants To Reduce Nuclear Bombs in Europe"]

[Text] Bonn—According to German Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg, the "preservation of a minimum stock of air-based tactical nuclear weapons in Europe" is "indispensable." He stated this before the meeting of the NATO defense ministers in Taormina, Sicily, who will gather as the "50th Nuclear Planning Group" on 17-18 October. This ministerial conference is considered by the NATO partners as a welcome occasion—before the alliance summit in Rome on 7 and 8 November—not only to discuss within the alliance the disarmament process for nuclear weapons initiated by U.S. President George Bush and to harmonize it, but also to coordinate

"central elements" (according to Stoltenberg) of a new military strategy that the heads of state and government want to deliberate in the Italian capital. On behalf of the FRG Government, Stoltenberg welcomed Bush's announcement to reduce tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and also the readiness of the Soviet president to basically follow suit with the U.S. efforts. At the same time, however, the German defense minister admonished that NATO continues to have a "common responsibility" and that it is necessary to "continue stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of alliance partners in Europe."

**"Minimum Stock"**

The minimum stock that Stoltenberg calls necessary would consist exclusively of aircraft-based U.S. bombs with nuclear charges. According to unconfirmed U.S. reports, about 1,700 such bombs are currently being stored in U.S. depots on the territories of seven European NATO states, including Germany. In Taormina it will probably be decided to reduce this amount to "well below 1,000," as Stoltenberg said. This would mean a stock of several hundred bombs for Germany. The Bonn defense minister stressed that it is not only his view that part of such a "minimum stock" should be accepted on German territory, but also the opinion of "the German Government," that is, of FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Despite changed security policy conditions in Europe, such weapons continue to be necessary. The alliance must be able to counteract a "nuclear threat of any kind," the defense minister said.

**Stoltenberg Admonishes**

Stoltenberg recalled that about 15 states are now able to build ballistic missiles and that the "proliferation" of nuclear weapons as well as of chemical and biological combat agents "in threshold countries and developing countries, some of which are in Europe's neighborhood," is progressing. In addition, despite improved relations between the West and the Soviet Union, it must not be forgotten that the Soviet Union as a whole and its individual republics have considerable nuclear potential.

Stoltenberg stressed that NATO will rely exclusively on bombs for its "air-based nuclear systems" in Europe. The development of "stand-off weapons" with acronyms such as SRAM 2 [Short-Range Attack Missile] and TASM [Tactical Anti-Ship Missile] is no longer being pursued; thus, there is "no acute need for decisions" on this issue in Taormina.

For NATO experts it is obvious that as a result of this limitation of a "minimum stock" to a bomb arsenal, the United States alone will have the capability to threaten the use of such systems if necessary. Only U.S. planes have Stealth capability, and therefore are able to deliver nuclear charges to their targets by means of Stealth bombers with a high degree of probability against a highly armed, technologically advanced opponent.

### Government Orders Tighter Export Controls

AU2110125391 Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG  
in German 20 Oct 91 p 27

["H.V." report: "German Exporters Suffer Under Controls"]

[Text] Bonn—The tightening of controls for all German exports, which was ordered because of the involvement of some companies in the armament of Iraq, Libya, and other states, has become a problem for the entire industry.

This is stated in an internal report of the FRG Government on the new way of dealing with export permits by the Federal Economic Office, which has become known to WELT AM SONNTAG. The report refers in particular to problems in competition with companies of other countries, whose governments have so far done without such strict control regulations. The FRG Government notes in this connection that it has already emphatically advocated a harmonization of the rules within the EC and with other industrialized countries.

According to the report, German exports are particularly affected by additional restrictions on the export of digitalized machine tools, which are not constructed for the production of weapons but can be used for this purpose. In addition, these restrictions apply to 50 chemicals, which can be used as preproducts for the production of chemical weapons.

German export bans and restrictions in this respect apply for states that are listed on a "Country List H," because abuse is feared in these countries. The list contains 54 states, including 14 for which an export ban is in effect, because they have not signed the nonproliferation treaty.

The government report also notes that the United States has also introduced such a list of countries. However, it contains "far fewer countries than the German list." First considerations concerning such a list are also under way in France.

According to the report, the FRG government wants to "continually reexamine whether all tightened control measures must be kept in effect without changes." In view of the continuing dangers in exports, so far "none of the regulations has proved to be dispensable." At the moment, it is being examined within the control system whether the "Country List H" must be kept in its entire length.

The government admits that the new regulations have placed a double burden on German companies that export. First, they face additional costs for "the preparation of applications for permits." Second, they must expect delays in the approval procedures, which are now particularly thorough.

According to the experiences of the Federal Economic Office, which will be replaced as of January by a Federal

Export Office with its own president as the authority for granting permits, German exporters now must expect the following waiting periods for export permits:

- up to four weeks in the field of exports to the West and to the south (without the OECD countries), in special cases up to six weeks;
- mostly 48 hours for exports to "nonsensitive countries," which include most Western partners;
- up to three weeks for "exports to the East"; in special cases up to six weeks.

### Companies Suspected in Iraq Weapons Production

#### Large Companies Involved

AU2210101191 Hamburg BILD in German 21 Oct 91  
pp 1, 6

[Text] Many more large German companies were involved in illegal deals with Iraq than were known up until now. The Kloeckner, Thyssen, Ferrostaal, Schloemann-Siemag, SMS Hasenclever, and Hochtief companies, among others, are suspected of having been involved in arms deals with Baghdad. This is stated in secret investigation documents of the FRG Economics Ministry, which are available exclusively to BILD. More than 100 cases have been investigated. Starting today, BILD will publish excerpts from the explosive Iraq documents daily.

According to the investigations of the FRG Economics Ministry—reports on which are available exclusively to BILD—the Kloeckner, Ferrostaal AG, Schloemann-Siemag, SMS Hasenclever, and Hochtief AG companies were involved in the construction of a big heavy industry complex in al-Taji, 30 km northwest of Baghdad. This facility produced large-caliber gun barrels and, perhaps, parts of weapons.

There was always something fishy about the acquisition of so-called "negative certificates", which permit the companies to conduct civilian business with Iraq. The FRG Economics Ministry says: There are "specific indications" that the "issued negative certificates" were obtained "by fraud." Thus Ferrostaal AG in Essen planned to build a universal forge in al-Taji. This company expressly indicated that the facility was for civilian use. However, after a search of the company by the public prosecutor's office, during which more than 700 files were impounded, the Bonn Economics Ministry "assumes that the company knew from the start that the facility it delivered was solely intended to produce cannon barrels." Investigations continue.

The Thyssen company received orders to build a similar facility in Iraq (under a contract worth 63.5 million German marks). Thyssen expressly stated that the facility was not constructed for military purposes. The Bonn Ministry found "specific indications" that "contradict the claimed civilian use."

**Participation in Missile Project 1728 Suspected**

This was not enough. Thyssen Machine Building GmbH concluded a contract for the delivery of turbo pump units. The Bonn Ministry suspects that this means involvement in Saddam's "Missile Project 1728." These were used to improve the liquid propellant technology of the Scud missiles (which were also used in Iraq's attacks on Israel during the Gulf war—the editors). Says the FRG Economics Ministry: There are "indications that the negative certificates may have been obtained fraudulently on the basis of incorrect information and the presentation of altered documents."

And the FRG Economics Ministry found something incredible: Among the technical drawings obtained from Thyssen and passed on the Federal Economic Office there were some in which parts had been blacked out. The obliterated parts of the drawings were made visible again by the Federal Office of Criminal Investigation and showed what substances were indeed intended to be pumped through the turbo pumps, namely "fuel" and "oxidizer" [preceding two words in quotation marks in English] (missile fuel—the editors). As a result, it was clear that the turbo pumps in question were constructed for use in missiles."

**More Companies Investigated**

AU2210103791 Hamburg BILD in German 22 Oct 91  
pp 1, 4

[Text] There are incredible new revelations about illegal deals by German companies with Iraq! Secret investigation documents of the FRG Economics Ministry show that several companies were involved in Iraqi nuclear projects. Investigations are currently being conducted into the companies H. und H. Metalfarm, Inwako GmbH, Interatom, Export-Union Duesseldorf, and Sitico GmbH, among others.

"Since 1988," the FRG Economics Ministry says, "Iraq secretly attempted to obtain technologies for uranium enrichment using the gas ultra centrifuge process.... A particularly crucial role is said to have been played in the Iraqi efforts by the H. und H. Metalfarm firm in Drensteinfurt." Investigations are proceeding.

There are "small individual parts"—such as ring magnets for the centering of the gas ultra centrifuges. Suspected: the Bonn company Inwako. "The ring magnets reportedly come from England. Investigations initiated against the German company Inwako by the Cologne Customs Investigation Office found out that Inwako ... arranged the deal ... without a permit." The public prosecutor's office is investigating.

Of the company Interatom GmbH, of Bergisch-Gladbach, the investigation report says: "In June 1990 there were indications that know-how in the nuclear field requiring a permit had potentially been passed on." Even

though the company employees refused to train Iraqi engineers in this field, "training was subsequently conducted externally."

"Comprehensive files" were found at Export-Union in Duesseldorf. The company is suspected of "having delivered steel...suitable for use in aviation and space technology, which requires a permit, to Iraq."

The ministry also has serious suspicions about the Sitico GmbH firm in Cologne. "Sitico apparently exported enriched uranium without an export permit."

**Eleven Companies Suspected of Dealing With Iraq**

AU2310113991 Hamburg BILD in German 23 Oct 91  
p 10

[Unattributed report: "BILD Reveals Iraq Papers; 11 Companies Still Suspected"]

[Text] The involvement of German companies in dirty deals with Iraq—the Federal Economics Ministry talks of "illegal exports by individuals or enterprises committing criminal actions"—is breathtaking. Even the Iraq embargo was violated. Today BILD gives the names of 11 German companies into which investigations are being conducted.

On 2 August 1990: Iraq occupies Kuwait, the UN Security Council agrees on the embargo against Iraq. Eleven German companies disregard it and negotiate with Iraq. Some of them supply things.

Now investigations are being conducted. Into what? According to the papers of the Federal Economics Ministry, into 11 companies.

For example, the Helmut Tafesa company in Hannover. Despite the embargo, it "continued to submit tenders for medical laboratory equipment." Minolta (Langenhagen) discussed "possibilities of circumventing the embargo, in order to supply photocopiers." The W. Hoffmann company of Rellingen "considered roundabout exports of spare parts for road-marking machines."

Investigations are being conducted into Tellkamp Engineering of Muelheim/Ruhr "because of they are suspected of having supplied artillery ammunition." The FIAB [expansion unknown] company of Wuppertal submitted tenders for the supply of screws."

The Hans Zuschlag company of Hamburg submitted "tenders for the supply of computer-controlled machines for the time after the expiration of the embargo." The Fama und Famin company of Hannover "considered roundabout exports." The Alnost company of Hamburg submitted "tenders to Iraqi enterprises in several cases." The accusation against the Condux Maschinenbau of Hanau reads as follows: "On Iraq's request, a tender for a hammer mill was submitted." The East Wing company of Hamburg "supplied spare parts for Iraqi tankers."

Strabag Bau AG and Strabag Bilfinger Universale of Cologne "carried out roundabout exports via Jordan." The Basra airport project was at issue. "Untruthfully, Jordan was given as the country of destination."

#### **Leybold Said Involved in Iraqi Nuclear Program**

AU0710104591 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German  
7 Oct 91 p 206

[Unattributed report: "German Company Involved in Iraqi Nuclear Deals"]

[Text] The German company Leybold, of Hanau, is obviously deeply involved in the Iraqi nuclear arms program. The U.S. Congress is therefore said to be planning to call on the German Government to take legal steps against Leybold. According to the recent UN report on Iraq's nuclear bomb laboratories, two precision instruments made by the Leybold company were found in these laboratories. The instruments, an electron-beam welding machine and a five-axial machine tool, were allegedly supplied by Leybold USA for Iraq's production of missiles, but maybe for its nuclear program. According to U.S. findings, the necessary additional high-tech equipment (a precision laser for the welding machine and a high-precise Allen-Bradley-8,200-type control instrument), which must not be exported from the United States, was supplied in a special delivery by the German Leybold AG. Said one U.S. expert: "This special equipment gives the plant such a high degree of precision that is only required for the production of nuclear arms." If these findings are confirmed in a formal procedure by the Pentagon, the Leybold AG company is threatened with considerable difficulties. Not only would the company be excluded from all orders from all official U.S. Government authorities, but none of the many thousand suppliers of the Pentagon would be permitted to have business relations with Leybold. "Yet, the most important thing is that we want the German Government to take action," as one congressional staffer put it.

#### **Companies Deny Giving Nuclear Technology to Iraq**

LD0410152791 Hamburg DPA in German 1345 GMT  
4 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Bon (DPA)—According to Government Spokesman Dieter Vogel, the Federal Government has no knowledge of a possible involvement of German firms in the Iraqi nuclear weapons program. The special UN commission dealing with the matter informed the Federal Government that documents seized in Iraq would still have to be examined, Vogel said in Bonn today. Vogel would not confirm speculations, according to which the firms Siemens, Messerschmidt-Boelkow-Blohm (MBB), and Pilot Plant were named in the documents.

In the meantime, spokespersons for MBB and Siemens denied, in reply to a DPA inquiry, reports saying the companies were involved in Baghdad's nuclear weapons program. [passage omitted]

Today an MBB spokesman announced the company had "not developed plants for uranium enrichment at any time and is not working in the field of nuclear technology." MBB has "never been involved in the development, testing, or production of ABC [atomic, biological, chemical] weapons." A spokesman for Siemens also denied involvement. Neither Siemens AG (Berlin/Munich), nor Siemens subsidiaries, has ever made deals in the nuclear field with Iraq, or with South Africa, from where a uranium enrichment plant is said to have been brought into Iraq.

#### **Charges of Nuclear Exports to Iraq Reported**

LD0310201491 Hamburg DPA in German 1840 GMT  
3 Oct 91

[Hamburg DPA in German at 1111 GMT on 4 October transmits a service message killing this item as follows: "Please do NOT use the DPA item: 'NDR: UN Report Indicates German Supply of Nuclear Reactor Plant to Iraq.' NDR has withdrawn the information the firm Pilot Plant had exported plants to Iraq."]

[Text] Hamburg/New York (DPA)—According to information from the North German Broadcasting Company (NDR), documents which UN inspectors confiscated in Baghdad last week show that the German firm Pilot Plant GmbH exported facilities for nuclear reactors to Iraq. The UN commission investigating Iraqi weapons of mass destruction has placed relevant material at the federal government's disposal, it was reported. The state prosecutor's office in Darmstadt is investigating the firm.

The Federal Government intended this week to ask the UN commission for permission to look at all the files which shed light on the involvement of German firms in the Iraqi nuclear weapons program. This could also help to establish if and under what circumstances a method for uranium enrichment developed by the German firms Siemens and MBB [Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm] had reached Iraq, NDR reports. According to information from THE NEW YORK TIMES, a plant of this type may have been delivered to Iraq via South Africa.

#### **'Many' Firms Involved in Illegal Iraqi Deals**

LD2010192591 Hamburg DPA in German 1817 GMT  
20 Oct 91

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—According to information available to BILD, many more large German firms have been involved in illegal dealings with Iraq than was hitherto known. Quoting secret inquiry documents of the Federal Economics Ministry in the hands of the newspaper, the Hamburg-published BILD (Monday edition)

writes that the Kloeckner, Thyssen, Ferrostaal, Schloemann-Siemag, SMS Hasenclever, and Hochtief firms are among those suspected of having been involved in covert arms deals with Baghdad. Over 100 cases have been investigated.

## NETHERLANDS

### No Firms Involved in Iraq's Nuclear Program

*LD0410124591 Hilversum Radio Netherlands  
in English 1130 GMT 4 Oct 91*

[Text] The Dutch Government says there is no indication the Netherlands contributed technology to Iraq's nuclear program. Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek, speaking with a parliamentary foreign affairs committee on Thursday, said there's no reason to believe Dutch firms directly or indirectly aided Iraq's efforts to develop a nuclear capability. Mr. van den Broek says he's assuming UN inspections in Iraq will produce no incriminating data on Dutch companies.

The Ministry of Economic Affairs is investigating a metal refinery in the southern province of Limburg. It's believed the company supplied strategic goods to either Iraq or Iran.

## UNITED KINGDOM

### Background of Iraqi Nuclear Expert Reported

*LD0210230491 London PRESS ASSOCIATION  
in English 2108 GMT 2 Oct 91*

[By Michael Chilvers, PRESS ASSOCIATION]

[Text] A leading Iraqi physicist who helped develop Saddam Husayn's nuclear weapons programme was once a researcher at a world-renowned London science college, it was disclosed today.

Dr Ja'far Dhiah Ja'far [name as received], now vice-president of the Baghdad Atomic Energy Commission, worked at the Kensington-based Imperial College from 1971-75. He was recently interviewed by the team of UN inspectors who secured documentary evidence that the Iraqi regime was illegally developing a nuclear bomb capability.

A spokesman for the International Atomic Energy Agency, whose inspectors made up part of the UN team, said today: "We have had regular dealings with Dr Ja'far, who is a highly-respected scientist and knows a great deal about the programme. He is not considered Mr Big, but he is the most senior person we have so far contacted and he has given us a lot of information about the dimensions of their programme."

Former colleagues at the Imperial College today paid tribute to Dr Ja'far, describing him as a "brilliant physicist". Dr John Hassard, of the college's high energy nuclear physics department, said: "Although he worked

in particle physics, which is not directly related to bomb-making, some of the technology would be useful if you wanted to go into that sort of work. He was a brilliant physicist and certainly capable of reaching the position he has now."

He said that after leaving the college Dr Ja'far worked for the Iraqis during the 1970s, heading the French procurement arm of the country's nuclear programme. But after a French-built reactor was sabotaged by the Israelis en route to Baghdad in 1979, Dr Ja'far was arrested and imprisoned.

"We thought he was dead," said Dr Hassard today. "But he has clearly re-established himself. I think the significance of that is that we should take the potential of the Iraqi nuclear programme very seriously."

### Hurd Presents Policy on Nuclear Export Safeguards

*LD2409192791 London PRESS ASSOCIATION  
in English 1758 GMT 24 Sep 91*

[Report by diplomatic correspondent Tom McMullen]

[Text] Britain today acted to stop the global spread of nuclear weapons in the light of reported attempts by Iraq to acquire an arsenal. Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd said the government had adopted a policy of "full-scope safeguards" in supplying nuclear materials. He said in a statement: "This means that in future Britain will not allow the export of any significant new nuclear supplies or materials to any country, other than the nuclear weapons states, where there are unsafeguarded nuclear installations." He said the policy was intended "further to strengthen the barriers against nuclear proliferation." Previously, Britain supplied materials to countries for use in nuclear facilities subject only to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Officials said indications that Iraq was trying to build a nuclear arsenal gave an "added relevancy" to the policy.

### Defense Minister Announces UK Nuclear Reduction

*LD2809092691 London PRESS ASSOCIATION  
in English 0816 GMT 28 Sep 91*

[By PRESS ASSOCIATION defense correspondent Charles Miller]

[Text] Britain is to scrap its short-range and battlefield nuclear weapons and will cease to carry nuclear depth bombs aboard Royal Navy ships, Defense Secretary Tom King said today. The move came after President Bush announced sweeping reductions in the United States's nuclear arms stockpile—a statement hailed by the prime minister as far-reaching, historic and imaginative. Mr Major urged President Gorbachev and the Soviets to respond "with equal imagination." But he stressed that Britain would continue to retain the minimum, but

adequate, conventional and nuclear forces "as the bed-rock of our security." Mr King said there would be no let-up in the proposal to replace the RAF's WE177 nuclear free-fall bombs with a new missile system and the government would continue with plans to replace the Polaris nuclear submarine with the more potent Trident system in the mid-1990s. "What we need to have is a credible deterrent," he told Radio 4's Today programme. The main threat in the past came from the huge Soviet nuclear arsenal and that has remained in place. "We now worry about who has control over that nuclear arsenal in the Soviet Union and republics," said Mr King.

Mr Major said the government would promote further initiatives to make the world safer, including an arms transfer register, in a bid to curb regional conflicts. He also urged a ban on chemical weapons, and a programme to ensure weapons now being banned or controlled in Europe did not spread to other countries. Mr Major said: "We have a unique chance to maintain our security at much lower levels of nuclear weapons and to ensure that those weapons that remain stay under the tightest control." For some time we have been consulting with our American and other allies how we can best consolidate the historic changes which have occurred in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. "We all agreed that we should take further imaginative steps in arms control, while preserving the essentials of our defence in a world which is still unstable." Mr Major stressed the importance of NATO and said the enormous strides made in arms control were possible because of policies based on "sound defence and solidarity, rather than pacifism and unilateralism." Mr King said there was scope for reducing Britain's defences but despite changes in the Eastern Bloc, the Soviet Union was "a very dangerous and unstable place and it still has huge stocks of weapons

and huge stocks of nuclear weapons as well." Maintaining one nuclear armed submarine at sea at any one time was the absolute minimum deterrent which could not be reduced, he said. It was widely known that a decision to scrap short-range and battlefield nuclear forces would be agreed at the NATO summit of heads of government in Rome in November. Under the plans, Britain will get rid of its 12 elderly Lance nuclear missile launchers and about 70 missiles currently based in Germany. Artillery shells for the Army's M109 Howitzers will be destroyed. The Royal Navy's nuclear depth bombs will be taken off vessels and put in a central store. These controversial weapons, believed to number no more than about 30, could be dropped by Sea Harrier jump jets and Sea King helicopters to attack enemy submarines. However, their effectiveness has been increasingly questioned in recent years and embarrassing protests made when British ships visited foreign ports. There is also going to be a gradual reduction in the number of American nuclear forces in Britain. Poseidon submarines based at Holy Loch on the Clyde will be withdrawn over the next few years with their 1,100 nuclear warheads. US nuclear depth bombs, which could number as many as 200, will be taken back from Britain to the US and the number of tactical free-fall bombs is also certain to be cut.

Gerald Kaufman, Labour's shadow foreign secretary, said President Bush's decision to cut the US nuclear stockpile was one of "great statesmanship and vision". Liberal Democrat leader Paddy Ashdown said the government should announce immediately that the Trident programme would go ahead on a scale no greater than the current Polaris system. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament also welcomed Mr Bush's proposals but "noted he remained committed to retaining air-launched nuclear systems, many of them in Britain".



**Van den Broek Urges SFRY Arms Embargo**

*LD2509142391 Hilversum Radio Netherlands  
in English 1130 GMT 25 Sep 91*

[Text] Speaking on behalf of the European Community, Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek has called on the UN Security Council to impose an international arms embargo against Yugoslavia.

**Mesic Opposes Arms Embargo as Helping Army**

*AU1110190291 Paris AFP in English 1847 GMT  
11 Oct 91*

[Excerpt] Paris, Oct 11 (AFP)—Yugoslav President Stipe Mesic, a Croatian, said Friday [11 October] the

international community should either end Serbian "aggression" in Yugoslavia or furnish weapons to Croatia.

A global arms embargo against Yugoslavia would only benefit the Serbian-controlled Army, he said after meeting French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. Slapping an arms embargo on both parties to the conflict, he said, would be akin to "putting the wolf and the lamb in the same cage." "What should be done," he said, "is what the Americans did in Iraq when Saddam Husayn bombed the Kurds." [passage omitted]